DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

Volume I Number 2

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1924

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*

## CONTENTS

PAGE

BITS OF LAY HISTORY. George Edwin Horr ..... 123

CHRISTIANITY'S MISSIONARY OBLIGATION. Henry B. Robins ..... 135

THE SALVATION OF THE MINISTRY. Claiborne Milton Hill ..... 146

THE ANGELS OF MONS. George Barton Cutten ..... 158

THE CHURCH AND THE GOSPEL. Spenser B. Meeser ..... 165

SOME ASPECTS OF A YOUNG MINISTER'S FAITH. Harold C. Phillips ..... 182

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES.

THE LENGTH OF THE LIVES OF THE PATRIARCHS. Edward Chiera ..... 199

ΥΠΩΠΙΑΖΕΙΝ, A WORD STUDY. Edward B. Pollard ..... 202

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS ..... 205

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 217

*Printed for* CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *By*

THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

**Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free**

# THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Vol. I APRIL, 1924 No. 2

## BITS OF LAY HISTORY

GEORGE EDWIN HORR
President Newton Theological Institution

A RECENT author, in paying a tribute to Doctor Chalmers, dwells on his oratory, his energy, and the tenderness of his sympathy, but suggests that the secret of his power was his devotion to Christ. " For Doctor Chalmers," he says, " Christianity was everything; his faith inspired every action of his life, every moment of his day, every word that he uttered, every letter that he wrote."

In such words we recognize the picture of a true minister of the gospel, but may we not see in them the characterization of a real Christian, whether he be minister or layman? For both have been redeemed by the same Saviour and owe a like service to the same Lord.

Christianity is not an affair of ministers, it is an affair of Christians. If the prayer for the coming of the kingdom of God is ever answered, apart from a millennial experience, it will not be simply through the labors of ministers of the gospel, but the victory of Christ will be won through the lives of Christians whether ministers or not, and the vast majority of them will be laymen—inspired by a faith that leads to the consecration of time, influence, and money to the ends of the kingdom.

There may be profit for us in considering the story of

one man, and then the record of a small group of men accomplishing great things for the faith because they made the interests of the kingdom of God first.

Lord Macaulay, in his history of England, after paying high tribute to John Bunyan, adds this paragraph:

> Great as was the authority of Bunyan over the Baptists, that of William Kiffin was still greater. Kiffin was the first man among them in wealth and station. He was in the habit of exercising his spiritual gifts at their meetings, but he did not live by preaching. He traded largely; his credit on the exchange of London stood high; and he had accumulated an ample fortune.[1]

William Kiffin was born in London in 1616 of a well-to-do family; but when he was fourteen the Great Plague swept away all his near kinsmen and he was left to the care of distant relatives, who invested the lad's fortune in their own concerns, and as usually happens, lost it.

At the age of fifteen, he was put out as apprentice, as he says, "to a mean calling," probably to a brewer. Occasionally straying into churches, he always responded to the message he heard. His own account of his religious experience is of interest:

> I heard Mr. Norton upon the text Isaiah 57 : 21, "There is no peace for the wicked." He showed what true peace was, and that no man could obtain it without an interest in Jesus Christ. This sermon made a very great impression on my heart, being convinced that I had not that peace. How to obtain an interest in Jesus Christ I knew not, which occasioned great perplexity of mind. I saw myself every day more and more sinful and vile—pray I could not—believe in Jesus Christ I could not. I thought myself shut up in unbelief. . .
>
> As the only thing I could do in these circumstances I took up resolutions to attend the most powerful preaching, which accordingly I did. By this means I found some relief many times from seeing a possibility that, notwithstanding my sinful state, I might at last obtain mercy. I resolved also to leave sin; but although to will was present, yet how to perform I had no power.

[1] Macaulay's "History of England," Vol. 2, page 215, Harper's Edition.

It pleased God, after some time, that I heard Mr. Davenport[2] (1597-1670) in Coleman Street. Mr. Davenport preached on the text 1 John 1 : 7, "And the blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth us from all sin." He showed the efficacy of the blood both to pardon and to cleanse from sin; and answered many objections which the unbelieving heart of man brings, against that full satisfaction Christ hath made for sinners. I found that many of them were such as I had made in my own heart; such as the sense of unworthiness, and the willingness to be better before I would come to Christ for life, with many other of like kind. This sermon was of great use to my soul. I thought I found my heart greatly to close with the riches and fulness of grace which God held forth to poor sinners. I found my fears to vanish, and my heart filled with love to Jesus Christ.

Soon after I heard Mr. Norton upon the text Luke 1 : 69, "And raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David," from which he showed that Jesus Christ was mightily accomplished with power and ability to save his people. My faith was exceedingly strengthened in the fulness of that satisfaction which Jesus Christ had given to the Father for sinners, and I was enabled to believe my interest therein. Then I found some ability to pray and meditate upon the riches of this grace; so that I could say with David, "When I am awake I am still with thee." I found the power of inbred corruption scatter, and my heart set on fire with holy love to Christ.[3]

It is worth noting that these are the spiritual experiences of a boy between fifteen and sixteen years old. They suggest that sometimes in our subservience to modern psychological theories we may underrate the capacity of immature youth to respond to the profoundest aspect of the gospel. In this record we have a clear account of what would be called "an old-fashioned conversion." There was a sense of sin, the consciousness of need of divine help, and the experience of peace through a living faith in Jesus Christ.

William Kiffin showed the reality of the change of heart that he experienced as a boy, through a long life of

[2] This is John Davenport who came to New England in 1637, and in 1638 became one of the founders of the New Haven colony. In his old age he was recalled to Boston (1668) as pastor of the First Church. It was hoped that his stalwart orthodoxy would raise a barrier to the tendencies of the Half Way Covenant.

[3] "Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin, Written by Himself and Edited from the Original Manuscript by William Orme," London, 1823.

eighty-six years. His Memoirs do not tell us how after two years as an apprentice he gained his freedom, but gradually the way opened to him to become "a trader," or as we should call it, an exporter and importer. In his Memoirs he says comparatively little about his business. It is evident that his heart was not set on money-making. After his first successful venture, he devoted himself to studying the Bible, and was greatly perplexed whether he should become a Non-conformist, or Dissenter. The fact that John Davenport and Thomas Hooker (the founder of Hartford, Conn.) left England because they could not conform, left a deep impression on him. His own account cannot be improved upon. He writes:

> I joined myself to an independent congregation, with a resolution that as soon as it pleased God to open the way, to go to New England, being now arrived at the age of 22 years. But the providence of God prevented me, and soon after it pleased God to provide for me a suitable yoke-fellow, who was one with me in judgment and joined to the same congregation.

The independent church with which Kiffin united was the famous Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Congregation, the mother church of English Congregationalists and Calvinistic Baptists. Those familiar with the so-called "Whitsitt Controversy" which raged a few years ago in the Southern Baptist Convention, will appreciate the situation in which Kiffin found himself. Three questions were in debate. Was there any so-called "valid" baptism that did not come through tactual succession from the apostles? In other words, did not "valid baptisms" involve necessity of a baptized administrator way back to the apostles? The second question related to the *subjects* of baptism. Could it be properly administered to infants, or must it be conditioned on the confession of personal faith by the recipient? The third matter of debate turned on the mode of baptism, whether by sprinkling, affusion, or immersion. The possible permutations of the answers to these questions divided the congregation as might perhaps be expected.

Kiffin became clear that the Scriptures taught believer's baptism and immersion, but remained a member of Jessey's church until 1644. His name heads the famous Baptist Confession drawn up by seven churches in that year.

Kiffin's business greatly prospered. His operations in the woolen trade with Holland became very large, and he availed himself of a five-week's grace before the coming into force of the restrictions upon the importation of foreign goods, to his great advantage. Kiffin seems to have had a genius for money-making. Cool, clear-headed, he was a typical English merchant of the highest class.

It was much to his worldly disadvantage that he was a Baptist. His career falls within the limits of that infamous series of laws known as "the Clarendon Code," which followed the Restoration, and continued through the reign of Charles II. By this legislation every office-holder in any municipal body must receive the Lord's Supper according to the manner of the Church of England. All ministers who would not conform to the Prayer Book were silenced and deprived of their livings. Non-conformists were forbidden to hold meetings at which five persons were present besides members of their own families; non-conformist ministers were prohibited from coming within five miles of any town which sent members to Parliament or in which they had served as ministers, except on burdensome conditions; and finally by the Test Act of 1673, non-conformists were denied all civil, naval, and military employment under the government.

Under the pressure of this legislation, many non-conformists returned to the Established Church, and it looked as if dissent might be stamped out of England.

William Kiffin was a shining mark. He had become very rich. His financial standing was so well known that it is said that Charles II demanded of him a loan of forty thousand pounds, equivalent to more that a million dollars in our money. Kiffin replied that he did not have that sum by him, but that

he would make the King a present of ten thousand pounds, about a quarter of a million of our money.

Every avenue of position and consideration was open to this London merchant if he would leave the Baptists; but he never seems to have considered doing so; even though he was imprisoned six times for attending Baptist meetings at which he frequently preached.

There was hardly a Baptist interest in England that did not share the support of William Kiffin's personal influence and money. His Memoirs make it clear that the value he set on money was what it enabled him to do for the kingdom of God. He really acted on the precept of Jesus, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." He traded in wool with Holland, and preached at the church he led in Devonshire Square, London, with one motive—to bring men to Christ, and spread the gospel.

At the end of the eighteenth century and in the first quarter of the nineteenth, Clapham, in Surrey, must have been one of the most delightful suburbs of London. Today the enormous extension of the metropolis has made it an undistinguishable part of the great city. At the period referred to, villas of rich men were grouped about the beautiful English Common. The rich London banker, Henry Thornton, a member of Parliament, lived in one of the larger homes. He was a warm friend of William Pitt, and the great statesman was fond of throwing off the cares of statesmanship by visiting this hospitable home. The library in Thornton's home was designed by Pitt, and it was standing until a few years ago. Near by lived Charles Grant, who had had a distinguished career in India, and was chairman of the Court of Directors of the East India Company. Across the Common was the home of Lord Teignmouth, who had been governor general of India. James Stephen, father of Sir James Stephen, grandfather of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, was a near neighbor.

The home of William Wilberforce adjoined that of Henry Thornton. Zachary Macaulay, father of Lord Macaulay, was a frequent visitor to Clapham, and also the two Milners, Joseph and Isaac. Charles Simeon and Hannah More (1745-1833) also belong to this group. Readers of Trevelyan's "Macaulay" will recall the affection with which Lord Macaulay always refers to "Aunt Hannah." She began her career as a successful writer for the stage, but abandoned this work for religious scruples. She was the author of stories that one still reads, such as "Cœlebs in Seach of a Wife." Her "Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education" led to her being invited to draw up a program for the education of the Princess Charlotte. She edited a monthly magazine which gained an immense circulation. Next to Robert Raikes she was the founder of modern Sunday schools. She was very liberal, but left a fortune of thirty thousand pounds.[4]

Thackeray has drawn a charming picture of the Clapham group in "The Newcomes." The character of Sophia Alethea Newcome gives real insight into the life at Clapham. The village church had an excellent rector in John Venn, son of Henry Venn, whose "Compleat Duty of Man" (1763) may still be found in the libraries of our older ministers, and Thomas Gisborne (1758-1846), the wealthy rector of Barton, was frequently heard to great profit in the Clapham pulpit. But Clapham is not famous in modern church history because of the excellent ministers of the church there, but solely because of the religious life and purpose of the laymen who lived around Clapham Common. All of them had been strangely impressed by the Wesleyan revival, and the influences that emanated from the careers of John Wesley and Whitfield. They were devoted members of the Church of England, and nothing could be farther from their thought than departing, like Wesley, from the mother Church. But they were in

[4] "Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography," by the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K. C. B., London, 1868, pp. 379-584.

profound agreement with the Evangelical theology. They believed in sin and in salvation by the grace of God in the cross of Christ. These laymen were rich, and could command every comfort and luxury, but they lived frugally, though not parsimoniously, and delighted to give to worthy causes rather than spend on themselves. Sir Henry Thornton made it a rule to devote six-sevenths of his income to benevolence, until the necessities of his increasing family led him to reduce the proportion to two-thirds. Wilberforce and Charles Grant and Lord Teignmouth and Hannah More showed the same spirit. They did not live for themselves, but there had dawned upon this group of high-placed laymen a vision of the kingdom of God as the supreme interest of human life. The spirit that had moved the London merchant, William Kiffin, a century before, was lodged in them. The name of Clapham is indissolubly linked with the abolition of the Slave Trade throughout British Dominions in 1807. It is true that the Slave Trade Association did not originate with this group, but it is also true, if this group had not taken the matter up it would not have succeeded in that generation. Clarkson and Sharpe laid the foundations of the great reform, but men who actually built the structure were the men who lived about Clapham Common, who met in Henry Thornton's library to lay their plans and then carried them out in the House of Commons. They were William Wilberforce, James Stephen, Zachary Macaulay, and Henry Thornton.

But these Christian laymen of large experience and wide vision could not remain indifferent to the religious condition of the world. Two great missionary enterprises were cradled at Clapham.

The Church Missionary Society (1799), one of the great missionary societies formed at the close of the eighteenth century, sprang out of the consultations at Clapham aided by like-minded evangelicals in London. A paper read by Charles Simeon precipitated the organization. It is significant that

both Lord Teignmouth and Charles Grant had lived many years in India, occupying the highest administrative positions. They had a vision that extended far beyond the narrow limits of an English porch, or England itself. They knew the pagan world. Six years before the organization of this Society English Baptists had formed the Baptist Missionary Society and sent William Carey to India, but up to this time neither the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel nor the London Missionary Society (1794) had extended its work beyond the British Colonies. No clergyman of the Church of England had as yet gone to heathen or Mohammedan lands. Throughout its history the Church Missionary Society has been loyal to the spirit of its founders. In the conflict between the Ritualist and Evangelical parties in the English Church this Society had always represented Evangelical interests. It was sympathetic with the Moody campaign in England and with the Student Missionary Movement, and in recent years its progress has outdistanced every forecast. Its policy of maintaining fraternal relations with Non-conformist Missionary Societies contrasts favorably with the attitude of the High Church Propagation Society.[5]

But the Anti-slavery and Sunday School Movements and the Church Missionary Society are not the only items to be put to the credit of the Christian laymen who made their homes about Clapham Common. The formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society is due to these same men. As early as 1662 there was a local society for the circulating the Scriptures in Wales. The first one to suggest the general circulation of the Bible was Joseph Hughes, a Welsh Baptist minister. He was asked to prepare an address on the subject. His essay was entitled "The Excellence of the Holy Scriptures as Argument for their more General Circulation." This was read at a ministers' meeting in the London Tavern, Bish-

[5] Gustav Warneck, "Outline of a History of Protestant Missions." Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1901, pp. 89-92. John H. Overton, "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century." London. Longmans, Green & Co.

opsgate Street, March 7, 1804. The proposal was immediately taken up by the Clapham laymen. Lord Teignmouth was elected president, Charles Grant and William Wilberforce, honorary secretaries, and Mr. Hughes, the Baptist minister, executive secretary, a position that he held for more than thirty years. It was suggested that though Mr. Hughes was admirably fitted for this position, the fact that he was a Baptist might alienate "the patronage and cooperation of the Established Church." This difficulty was met by choosing Josiah Pratt, connected with the Clapham group, as joint secretary.[6]

It is impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the work accomplished by this greatest Bible Society in the world. Under its care the Bible has been translated into all civilized languages and barbarous tongues reduced to writing. Millions upon millions of copies of the Word of God have been circulated through the whole world. When we contemplate these familiar results it is well to reflect that the seed of this stupendous harvest came from the insight of an obscure Baptist minister, and the soil which it fructified was the purpose of the merchants and statesmen at Clapham to live for the kingdom of God.

The story of these careers is an inspiring ideal for Protestant Christians of today. Unlike the Romanists, Protestants, in theory at least, do not believe that the work of the church is to be done wholly by ministers. The priesthood of believers involves an obligation as well as a privilege. Indeed, privilege and obligation are one. During the last few years there has been a most encouraging revival of lay interest in the missionary and educational work of Protestant denominations. The Laymen's Missionary Movement in our own denomination is typical of a common development in Protestantism, and the New World Movement which is now coming to a close, in part grew out of it. There has been something like a real consecration of time and influence and money by certain

[6] "Encyclopedia of Missions," p. 105.

individuals. Still very few have had the vision. The notion widely prevails that a prosperous Christian business man is doing his full duty if he pays a few hundred dollars a year to the support of his church and a similar sum to the denominational causes. The general advocacy of tithing as the Scriptural method of meeting money obligations to the kingdom tends to obscure the real obligation. Undoubtedly much larger amounts of money can be raised if people generally can be made to believe that the tithe is a matter of divine command. Leaving out of account the question just what the Hebrew tithe was, a matter upon which competent students of the Scriptures are divided, no offering of a tenth or a fifth meets the Christian ideal, which is not so much for God, and the rest for self, but all for God, in whose eyes a reasonable subsistence for self and household and decent provision for the future is a debt to him as well as to one's self.

That is the spirit that moved William Kiffin, and William Wilberforce, and Charles Grant, and Lord Teignmouth, and to them appeals for missions and evangelism and Bible work were not so many burdensome calls, but so many avenues for service which they rejoiced to enter with their time and influence and money. With them there was no question of a tenth, less or more, but all they could do for the kingdom. It staggers imagination to picture the resources of influence and wealth that would be immediately available for church support, for missions and education, if the Christian men of today were moved by this same spirit.

But it is not simply that the material resources of the kingdom would be so enormously multiplied by this attitude of laymen toward possessions, but it would present the most convincing argument for the Christian faith—a defense that became aggressive, an apologetic that was polemic.

The lust for material possessions, for wealth, for the comfort and consideration that money brings, is a distinctive mark of modern civilization worth speaking about, but never before

in human history has the attainment of riches by large numbers of persons been so possible, and therefore more are grasping for it. Now to see a man to whom wealth has come, who has attained a position which others envy, not using it for luxury, display, or self-indulgence, but foregoing what he might easily and legitimately have, even to the point of self-sacrifice, for the sake of promoting the cause of Christ—is not that impressive? Is not that a testimony to the reality of spiritual interest beyond cavil? We talk very loosely about self-denial and self-sacrifice, often failing to realize that self-denial is not resisting temptation to do wrong. That is not self-denial, that is simple moral conduct, but self-denial is giving up something that belongs to you, to which you have an incontestable right, and devoting it to a higher end than your own self-gratification. Such self-denial becomes an incontrovertible evidence to your real appreciation. It sets beyond dispute your scale of values. "They that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking another country."

Christian ministers, of course, if they are true to their calling, are always bearing this witness, but in the nature of the case their witness can seldom be just that of the layman. Lord Rosebery in closing his centenary address on Dr. Samuel Johnson touches this fact with a sure insight. Doctor Johnson, the great literary figure of his century, was an humble, devout Christian. Lord Rosebery says of him:

> Men like this are the stay of religion in their times and for those who come after. Laymen who hold high and pure the standard of their faith do more for Christianity, it may be safely averred, than a multitude of priests. To say this is not to disparage the clergy; rather the reverse, for it implies that their course is regular and habitual. But their championship is felt to be the natural result of their profession and their vows, while the conspicuous layman who is also a conspicuous Christian has all the honors of a volunteer. No one, I think, can doubt that Samuel Johnson and William E. Gladstone were priceless champions of their faith.[7]

[7] "Miscellanies," Vol. I, pp. 57, 58.

# CHRISTIANITY'S MISSIONARY OBLIGATION

HENRY B. ROBINS
Professor of History and Philosophy of Religion and Missions,
Rochester Theological Seminary

WHAT is the obligation of organized Christianity toward the non-Christian world? How can the Christian church fulfil its missionary obligation? The theme is trite. We all assume that we know. But, do we? Does the science of missions, assuming for purposes of discussion that there is such a science, agree with average opinion in our churches upon this matter? Is there a Christian consensus, a Protestant consensus, on the matter?

It would probably be fair to say that the earlier missionaries and the groups which were interested in their endeavors, thought of the undertaking broadly as that of preaching, heralding. In a word, the responsibility was that of evangelization in the narrower or more restricted sense of the term. Setting out with the view that the missionary objective was to tell as many people as rapidly as possible the essential story of the Christian gospel, these missionaries encountered as a rule situations in which they must work first for individuals. Mass evangelism was rarely of much account until there had first been a period of individual, personal evangelism.

Beginning as they did without a philosophy of missions, and proceeding by the direct method of personal evangelism, these earlier missions were still free and unstereotyped in procedure. It so happens, however, that at a somewhat later time in Protestant missionary history we find missionary bodies launching their undertaking with a pretty definite theory of missions. Perhaps the most outstanding illustration is that of the China Inland Mission, which was controlled in its procedure by the formative notion of an early return of our Lord, whose return is delayed, it was believed, only by the require-

ment that the gospel should be preached to all the nations for a witness before His coming.

Even the Student Volunteer Movement, in its earlier stages, was somewhat under the same influence. This appears in its watchword, "The Evangelization of the World in This Generation." The watchword was formulated, one would judge, under the influence of the conviction that there is imminent the personal advent of our Lord and all that series of events associated with it. The watchword is no longer interpreted in millennial fashion. The leaders of the movement now recognize that the fullest evangelization requires an intensive type of procedure for which a single generation will not suffice. All that the watchword now need connote is the responsibility of each generation of Christians for their non-Christian contemporaries. Nevertheless, the distinct picture portrayed by the older emphasis upon the watchword was that of a vast company of individual missionaries hurrying to and fro, to the end that the last man might hear of Jesus within this generation.

Even although the China Inland Mission started out with a pretty definite theory, and has held in general to that view of Christianity, it became apparent to the leaders of that movement, with the lapse of time, that they must do more than they had set out to do. As Bliss puts it,[1] they learned that

> the mere preaching of the gospel to scattered individuals, or even the gathering of converts into a fellowship that has no definite organization or special training, both of leaders and of membership, falls far short of the full power of an organized, educated Christian church.

Moore is right when he says [2] that

> . . . the wisest of their own number would probably not have contended that all the work which needed to be done could be done in this way.

The China Inland Mission was a great pioneering agency, but the task of the Christian church in the non-Christian world is not completed at the pioneer stage.

[1] "The Missionary Enterprise," p. 374.
[2] "The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World," p. 191.

Most of the evangelical missionary organizations did not interpret their undertaking in a narrowly millennial fashion; yet, until within a few decades, the greater proportion of them continued a predominant emphasis upon expansive evangelism. Indeed, it is a fair question whether that is not still the predominant emphasis in Protestant missionary effort.

Essential disagreements as to policy do not lie with the term " evangelize." All will agree that the goal is evangelization, if only a sufficient content be given that term. But, assuming that evangelization in the broad sense is the big, comprehensive aim of missions, it still remains to inquire what is involved in adequate evangelization, both as to content and as to method.

The World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910 was perhaps the first really serious effort to achieve a unified theory of missions. The Conference placed evangelism first—" not, of course, that by foreign missionaries alone, but also by trained native evangelists." And this task would not, in the judgment of the Conference, be completed, until there should be an autonomous native church, with a trained ministry, and with an adequate version of the Bible at its command. The Conference definitely distinguished education, as a missionary method, from evangelism. Education it placed in a second group of missionary methods " of undoubted value," a method which, in certain fields and under certain conditions, it judged " worthy to be ranked almost in the same class with those named indispensable." This was evidently a very conservative view of education, and hardly gave Christian education its rightful place as a direct evangelizing agency.[3]

A series of conferences, under the auspices of the Edinburgh Conference Continuation Committee, followed in 1912-1913. It is interesting to find the India National Conference answering the question as to what is involved in evangelism. Its problem was set by the monstrous mass movements of the

[3] Report of Commission, I, pp. 311-317.

depressed classes. And the Conference judges [4] that " any such effort, to be adequate, must provide for:

1. Such a body of trained teachers as will not only meet immediate needs, but also will enable us to deal with large accessions in the near future.

2. A body of clergy, in whose training every care is taken to secure a high standard of knowledge and spiritual life.

3. A careful preparation of candidates for baptism.

4. Speedy organization of congregations.

5. A wise and carefully thought-out system for training in knowledge and worship such congregations as are largely composed of illiterate adults.

6. A method of discipline under which action proceeds from the people themselves and expresses the conscience of the Christian community.

7. An adequate system of village schools which will enable the people to read the Bible and to join intelligently in public worship, and at the same time will not unfit the children for their future occupations.

8. Medical aid in village districts, not only as an act of Christian love and compassion, but also as the only alternative to the superstitions that are inseparably connected with the native methods of treating disease.

9. An organized effort for the social and economic improvement of the Christian community, including especially schemes based on the co-operative principle, which are best adapted for this end, as they avoid pauperizing the people and are in themselves a moral education.

This statement, in the sober judgment of that distinguished missionary group, is a comprehensive outline of the minimum involved in evangelizing an outcaste Indian community. It should be noted that it includes, directly or by implication, all the major forms of missionary effort. *These are all evangelism.* Even so, this is a minimum statement.

Some years ago there appeared an annual report of the American Baptist Telugu Mission which had upon its front cover the picture of an average Telugu Christian family. There were seven or eight members of the family, seated on the ground in front of a windowless and doorless one-room

[4] " The Continuation Committee Conferences in Asia," p. 124.

mud hut. I shall not forget the impression which it made upon me. Immediately I asked the question, How far can the Christian idea of home develop in that situation? Where are the privacies? Where is the basis for the building of that finer sentiment which goes with the idea of home? Where is the elbow-room that human nature needs? I am well aware that affluence, or even comfort, is no guaranty of growth in grace. But it seemed to me that here, in this elemental primitivity, home life and family religion must be sadly conditioned.

Now let that Telugu hovel stand as a symbol of the mental furnishing of multitudes who accept Christ. Is the task done when they have heard the simple story and believed it? Let nobody suppose that the acceptance of that story means an immediate or even an ultimate mental housecleaning. It means nothing of the sort. For example, out in China, some three years ago, I met two prominent members of a Baptist church who were doctors of the old Chinese type. Their conversion to Christianity had not changed their medical practise materially. Now anybody who knows how ancient China treated the sick is at once aware that the medical practise of these men continued to be a mixture of a practical knowledge of the medicinal value of herbs with a mass of hoary superstition and magic. How much of a man is it necessary to convert to make him a Christian? Must the primitive folkways of a people be exchanged for a culture that accords with an enlightened Christian view of life or not? The great mass of these converts is illiterate, dependent solely upon what comes by hearsay, by tradition, or by the revolutionary teaching of the mission. Must not the mission at least set the new community of believers in the way of becoming more completely Christian?

Even if mass evangelism were approved as the one method of approach, it would not be difficult to show that, as a foreign enterprise, it breaks down of its own weight. As is said by Dr. John P. Jones:

> It is clear that we cannot grapple adequately with the task of the future on the same lines that we have been working on in the past. . . On these lines the gathering of converts is bound to end in a short while, for when the number of Christians in a district rises to about 6,000, the whole time of the missionary in charge and the whole of the financial resources at his disposal are absorbed in the pastoral care of the Christians.

Such being the case, the future of the missionary enterprise is conditioned by the building up of a competent native Christian community. To multiply converts and leave them steeped in ignorance and common racial superstition, without leadership, without object-lessons of a different way of life, without educational and other institutions, and in some cases, without an adequate economic base for a better order, is to fail of the objective of our undertaking.

The extent to which it is necessary to develop a particular line of work in order to insure the completion of our task depends very much upon local conditions. In Japan, for example, where popular education is so nearly universal, it is not necessary for the missions to engage in elementary education to any considerable extent. But there is still the same reason for maintaining secondary and higher schools that there is for such schools in America under denominational auspices, a reason reenforced by the fact that in Japan the higher schools are even more secularist in spirit than in America. Again, in Japan, it is not necessary to engage in medical work to any extent, for Japan has a professionally competent body of physicians, and the country is more and more interested in questions of public health and sanitation. And yet a Christian hospital and an occasional Christian physician help to show the distinctive spirit which moves Christianity at its best.

It should be observed, however, that the Christian enterprise in these non-Christian lands is to be carried through to completion not by the missionary body, but by the native Christian communities. And the strategy of the missionary enterprise lies in the setting up of Christian communities capable

of self-direction, of self-propagation, and ultimately of self-support. One does not have to form his own judgment in this matter, he needs simply to heed the missionary. The China National Conference of 1913 declared that "the chief place in carrying out the task must be assigned to the Chinese churches. . . In the main China must be evangelized by the Chinese." This is but typical of the great body of missionary opinion.

The significance of education as a missionary method is best seen when it is viewed in its relation to the problem of a competent Christian community. It would seem perfectly obvious that such a community must have ample and able leadership. This phase of the matter has received pretty careful attention during recent decades, but we are not yet through with the question. We have still to determine how far institutions in which such leaders are trained shall be replicas of our Western institutions, whether they shall preserve the major emphases of our Western educational systems, and the like. Nor is this a matter for us alone. The fact is that great racial groups are going far toward deciding this themselves. Japan has assimilated her institutions to the Occidental type; China is rapidly doing so; India has departed from that tradition only in sporadic instances, since the British *raj* was established there. If we are to engage in higher education for leadership we cannot counter the tide of national opinion. Our problem is to take such a system, adapt it to our specific purposes, and interfuse it with the Christian spirit. And the judgment of competent recent students of missionary higher education is that what is needed is not so much more institutions, as institutions which shall be educationally more adequate.

The better we are acquainted with the surging tides of intellectual life in the new Orient, for example, the more shall we recognize the need of an adequately trained Christian leadership if Christianity is to make any significant impression upon the generation which is to shape the future of these great

lands. Unless Christian leaders can make an impression upon their educated non-Christian contemporaries, not alone by the superior moral quality and spiritual temper of their lives, but also by their insight, their intellectual grasp, their breadth of outlook, and their social passion, we shall not dare to hope for any significant result. It is probable that the significance of such a statement of the case is but loosely grasped today even by the rank and file of missionary administrators. But the report of so competent a body as the Educational Commission which surveyed "Christian Education in China" some two years ago cannot be ignored. Such a report puts the problem again into its right perspective.

The case for an educated leadership may be viewed as already well established. But there is another situation which has not received so careful attention. Where we thrust a highly trained leadership into a primitive situation, a very marked hiatus at once appears. Such a leadership is inevitably youthful to begin with, and subject to all the enthusiasms and ardors of youth; it therefore not seldom finds it difficult to live with and to endure the conservatisms of the illiterate or backward community. Situations of strain almost inevitably arise, and the value of the new leadership is for the time being reduced by the lack of appreciative and supporting lay leadership. It is now seen pretty clearly that if we are to have the best results from our trained professional leadership, we must have an appreciative and supporting lay leadership. It is on this ground that the above report on "Christian Education in China" declares [5] that

> What may be called the backbone of the Christian community will come mainly neither from the elementary schools nor from the university, but from the middle schools. Pupils who do not reach this level of education will scarcely be prepared to be lay leaders. If they go beyond the middle school they will for the present at least largely join the professional classes. The strength of the church will come from the middle

[5] P. 52f.

school. . . It is evident therefore that the maintenance of the right kind and number of these schools is at the center of the educational problem.

What is here urged for China is equally true wherever Christian education is largely in demand.

It can readily be shown that Christian schools have themselves been direct and most fruitful evangelizing agencies. They have been the means of reaching not a few influential characters who must otherwise have remained untouched by Christianity. But Christian schools are not maintained solely on this ground, and comparisons which are instituted on the statistical basis between a school's quota of converts and those in some field where a mass movement is on, are patently unfair. When a school can show such a record, in any given year of its history, as Shanghai College could report in its *Bulletin* of June, 1923, the case for the college as an evangelizing agency, among just those people who are to be tomorrow's leaders, would seem to be established. The report is as follows:

During the year 1922 there were about 50 decisions for Christ and 36 additions to the church. About seventy-five per cent. of the students in the College were Christians and about thirty per cent. in the Academy, *ranging from twenty-one per cent. in the first year of the Academy to one hundred per cent. in the senior year of the College.* [Italics mine.]

This is a remarkable record. But it still is true that the great reason for maintaining our higher schools lies in their relation to the autonomous, self-supporting, self-propagating Christian community which we are seeking to establish. In the end such schools will become accountable to, and will be supported by, the Christian community itself, as our own denominational schools in America are.

It would perhaps be difficult to decide upon any theoretic basis just when Christianity may be regarded as having become properly indigenous. But, like many another issue, the question will probably not be decided on that basis. The fact

is that we have emerging in a number of instances just such Christian communities. And this is the meaning which lies back of all expressions of racial self-consciousness and of all movements to organize churches which shall fuse our denominationalized Western Christianity into new unities determined by other considerations. The result of this new current of life is that, in advance of all readiness for it on the part of most mission boards and societies, we have the claim of a new leadership, the assertion of autonomy or the right to it, and the actual assumption by the native Christian community of an increasing series of responsibilities. Problems of devolution in missionary administration will increase within the next generation rather than diminish. And we should rejoice therein, for this marks a new epoch in the history of our expanding faith.

It means, for one thing, that when we find the new community able to take over, to direct, and to support one line after another of Christian endeavor, and we in consequence push into the regions beyond, we shall go by their counsel and perhaps, in so far as we work within the territory of any such autonomous group to complete its evangelization, even under their direction. This position has already been taken by representatives of the American Board (Congregational) in the evangelistic work of that organization in Japan, and will no doubt be followed by others.

We need not anticipate an early term to our responsibility in most fields, for the very reason that the implications of evangelization, the lengths to be traversed before our goals can be realized, increase with experience. But we must recognize that the conditions under which we shall labor with the new and properly self-conscious Christian communities in these fields are rapidly changing. They must increase, while we must decrease—perhaps not in the magnitude of our endeavor, but certainly in the scope of our authority. We shall be the less in haste to leave and they the less willing that we should

go, as we together gain a larger vision of what it means to Christianize the life of a people.

For the new Christian community is, after all, but a proximate goal. The church is a means to an end; the end itself is a new order of life among men. A number of years ago President Henry Churchill King contributed an article to *The International Review of Missions* under the title "Christianity the Only Hopeful Basis for Oriental Civilization"; such it is, indeed, for any civilization, whether Oriental or Occidental. The functions of the church are not all to be included under its responsibility for a new social order. I cannot conceive of a time when the church will cease to be needed to make secure the Christian order of life; much less can I conceive of a time when it will be dispensable as an organized mediator of the religious needs of the race. And I am heartily of the opinion that an indigenous Christianity can express and maintain itself only through the institution and perpetuation of real Christian churches. Thus the immediate responsibility of our Western Christianity, its missionary obligation, is the building of fully functioning Christian churches as the centers of effective Christian community life. Such a task involves all that we are now doing, and much more than we are now doing, upon most of our fields.

# THE SALVATION OF THE MINISTRY

CLAIBORNE MILTON HILL
President of the Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, California

THERE is more than one sense in which we may speak of "The Salvation of the Ministry." It is not so long ago that a well-known writer declared his belief that,

> the routine Sunday by Sunday preaching, the reading of selected portions of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of particular texts, no longer exists for the greater part of the people.

In so far as that conclusion is based upon facts it justifies my subject. But the saving of the ministry rightly includes the saving of the men who are already in the ministry, prepared by their education and experience to discharge its duties. An editorial in *The Baptist* some time ago called attention to the fact that there is a "leakage of ministers. Losses are sustained year by year because of the number of ministers who leave the active pastorate." The editorial is closed with these words:

> It is quite time that our thought was given to this matter of saving to the ministry men whose hearts are really in the pastorate, but who are forced out by circumstances which are apparently beyond their control.

There is not only leakage in the ministry, there is wastage due to the fact that too many ministers fail to grow in power with the passing of the years. Every man who has failed to attain unto what would be normal for him has wasted just so much of that power which is beyond price in the kingdom of God—the power of a progressively perfected personality.

Sometimes this failure to keep on growing is chiefly the fault of the man himself, perhaps more frequently it is due to the conditions under which he is compelled to live and work.

So, also, the ministry will not be saved unless it is constantly recruited with the best of our young Christian manhood. Whatever can be done to put heart and hope into the present-day ministry will help to make the ministry attractive to young men.

In writing on "The Salvation of the Ministry" I have in mind these and other phases of the whole matter of an adequate ministry. The responsibility for the serious situation which exists lies wholly upon no one's shoulders. The needed changes can come only through ministers and laity working together.

Let me begin by saying that the churches must conserve the ministry. I shall be brief here where so much might be said. The churches demand an efficient ministry—almost an ideal ministry. No one can blame a church for wanting an ideal man. But we may question whether churches recognize their own responsibility for producing and developing the type of minister they demand. There are several things the churches should remember when they begin to set up high standards for the ministry. One is that the ministry arises out of the churches. A congregation that has not in a period of years sent out into the ministry one or more of its ablest young men has no great call on the best product of some other church. But do not the colleges and theological schools determine the quality of the ministry? The schools have their large responsibility here, but they can only do their best with the men whom the churches send to them. Looking at it from this point of view, it becomes evident that if at any time the churches are unable to find an adequate ministry, the prime responsibility is their own.

Again the churches would find it easier to secure the kind of pastors they are looking for if they were not so willing to ordain young men and thrust them out into the work before they have secured the proper fitting for their calling. A young man of good parts and holy purposes is one of the most precious

assets of the kingdom of God. The churches ought to look upon him as such. They should plan wisely and liberally to help the young man to fit himself for his high calling. They should found and equip the schools in which he may receive his training. They should provide ways and means by which he can maintain himself while he is in training. This should not be made too easy, but it should be made reasonably possible. In other words, the churches should look toward the future of its young men and encourage them to seek their highest self-development that they may become the strong men the churches need.

But pursuing a little further this matter of the responsibility of the churches, it needs to be said that the churches must conserve the ministry by creating better conditions under which the minister shall work. Often that will mean better material conditions for their minister. An editor advertised his publication as a first-class newspaper, issued as second-class matter from a third-class post-office. A second-class congregation sometimes expects a first-class minister to be one hundred per cent. effective with third-class material equipment. In more than thirty-five years experience and observation in the ministry on the Pacific Coast, I have again and again seen the heart taken out of noble men by well-nigh impossible conditions under which they have been expected to produce results. We would have grown more strong men among us if our young men in their growing days had not been obliged to expend so much precious time in seeking to provide better material conditions.

Besides expecting their minister to work with poor equipment, the church often expects him to live in a good house, to own a library of which the church-members are proud, to attend conventions at his own expense, to give generously to all benevolent objects, to educate his children, and to retire when he is fifty-five or sixty years of age—all on a salary that in fact barely meets the necessities of life. Fortunately, we

have seen considerable improvement in these matters in recent years. But it is a well-known fact that while the cost of living has increased one hundred per cent., ministers' incomes have in some cases increased only a fraction of that. Increasing attention will have to be given to material things by the churches if we are to have the ministry the churches want and the times demand.

But infinitely more important is it that the churches furnish the social and moral and spiritual conditions which will make for ministerial growth and power. We need attractive, magnetic congregations. A pastor needs an atmosphere favorable to spiritual results. The people quite as much as the preacher are responsible for that. True support of a minister sometimes is vastly more vital than houses and treasuries and organization. The spirit of the living God welcomed into the hearts of the people will create the spiritual conditions under which the best in the minister will be conserved and developed.

As a second point let me say that the men in the ministry must save each other. We need a new understanding of the solidarity of the prophetic brotherhood. If there is any group among men who ought to be bound together in real fellowship it is the Christian ministry. One is our Master. One aim, and one alone, inspires us: that our Master should be Lord of all. In our fellowship that selfishness and personal ambition and insincerity which in so many of the relationships of life make for bitterness and discord and bear fruit in strife and war, with us are, in the nature of the case, ruled out.

The reality comes far short of the ideal here. It will make for the salvation of the ministry if we can recover the sense of the solidarity of our brotherhood. We ought to exercise wisdom and vigilance in admitting only worthy men into our ranks, and we ought to be courageous in purging our brotherhood of the unworthy. Then we ought to live up to the principles which bind us together.

Brotherhood means helpfulness. Through mutual help-

fulness we shall conserve our ministerial usefulness. A few specific suggestions may be permissible here. They are so obvious that perhaps they need emphasis.

We ought to exercise the ministry of mutual helpfulness by avoiding hurtful criticism. Some years ago I heard a minister described as "a murderer of the reputation of his brethren." Where criticism is not deliberately malicious, it is often thoughtlessly cruel and hurtful. Of course every man has his limitations. We make ourselves to a large degree, and we must be taken for what we are. Our brethren have to be honest and not mark us up too high when they are called upon to commend us. But they must not mark us down without good reasons. The habit into which some men fall, of careless or envious comment upon the limitations, theological, social, intellectual, and what not, of their fellow ministers is destructive of real spiritual values in the kingdom of God. The biographer of Edward Judson declares that he never heard him criticize a brother minister. Most of us need to guard against the temptation to measure and weigh our brethren, and then to announce the result in the ear—if not on the housetop.

But all criticism is not to be decried. It may be helpful. Doubtless we all need far more honest criticism than we receive. Kindly, intelligent criticism ought to be welcomed. But it is embarrassing to most of us to give it and too often it is ungraciously received. Naturally, we do not care to have even our friend put his finger too firmly on our lameness. Because such chastening seemeth for the present not to be joyous but grievous, we are too often willing to go on in our lameness. But such criticism may be the minister's salvation.

We must not, of course, think of criticism as always pointing out faults. Appreciative criticism has not been given its rightful place in our relationships. It is doubtful if this world has ever tested to the full the power of sincere and hearty appreciation. Within the ranks of the ministry would be a

good place to make the test. By a thoughtful ministry of encouragement we could add to the effectiveness of our brethren who are too often left to live and toil in lonely isolation.

There are times when a minister needs the counsel and practical help of his fellow ministers. One of these times is when he decides that he must change his field of labor. Such times come to every minister. There need be no shadow of blame that the necessity comes. There ought to be no self-blame that it is so. But it ought to be easier and pleasanter than it commonly is for the minister to transfer to a new field of service. The churches ought to be more reasonable about it than they are. Men who have done a good work in our churches ought to have their claims considered by near-by churches needing pastors. Many a man could be put into the way of larger usefulness by other men's thoughtfulness.

We shall conserve our ministry by promoting the younger men among us. Our young men must make themselves worthy of promotion. Let them, on the one hand, do their part to make ready for a larger task. Let the churches be alert to promote the growing young men to more exacting positions. I do not, of course, imply that this is not often done. I do wish to say that a settled policy of this kind would build up our ministry. Increased responsibility brings increased strength. Far too often even ministers encourage the heresy that the able men live in another State. Distance seems to invest them with gifts not seen in those near-by. The man near at hand is judged by what he can do as shown by what he has done. The man at a distance is valued at what he can do plus what it is imagined he can do. So he is summoned to the task. Strangely enough the imagined virtues vanish after a little and the man is estimated like all others about him, by the facts in the case. We need to go afar for reenforcements now and again, but let us see to it that the churches do not overlook our capable brethren who are our neighbors.

These are a few suggestions concerning ways in which

ministers can help one another. A brother closed a letter to the writer with these words, "I can help all my brethren, and they can all help me." That spirit lived out among us would not only help to prevent leakage and wastage; it would increase the resources of our individual personalities and add to our value as servants of God.

It must be noted, in the third place, that the men of the ministry must save themselves. It is true that there are senses in which the ministry cannot save itself. There is a sense, however, in which the men of the ministry alone can save themselves.

Perhaps it will not be amiss to be more specific and say that the individual man in the ministry must save himself. I am thinking here of the individual's responsibility for being the best and most efficient minister possible for him. In so far as any of us fail here, there is irreparable loss. Another has reminded us of that bit of wisdom with an edge to it, which Owen Wister puts into the mouth of "The Virginian": "A middlin' doctor is a pore thing, and a middlin' lawyer is a pore thing, but keep me from a middlin' man of God."

It is not meant that all can attain to the same distinction. All are not equal in native gifts, nor do all have the same opportunities. No man is to blame himself for lack of achievement if he honestly endeavors to make the most of himself. It is healthy for us to reflect now and again upon the fact that each of us might be a better and more useful man if he had perseveringly resolved upon it. Would any one of us deny that the outward man might have been so developed and disciplined that it would be less of a hindrance and more of a help in our great calling? Ian MacLaren in his "Yale Lectures" says that "The spiritual prosperity of a congregation depends very largely on the minister being not only sound in doctrine, but also sound in body." And he attributes the fact that in the Gospels "we have nothing sickly, unreal, or mawkish, or gloomy" in part to the other fact that three of these

Gospels came from "weather-beaten Galileans and the fourth from a physician." And he adds, "Fresh air in study and sleeping room, regular outdoor exercise, and rightly observed holidays will help the minister to bodily salvation."

Again, the minister will save himself by living up to the fact that the inner man can be grown to greater proportions. He must be practically alive to the fact that his intellectual power as well as the sum of his knowledge can be increased and also greatly enriched.

Every man needs to gird up the loins of his mind. This is something a man can do and must do not only when he is young but through the years. Here it is keeping consistently at it through youth, manhood, and the increasing years that will show results. Paul flung across the sea to Timothy a great word—a word that has come across the greater seas to us—the word "Study." We shall not save ourselves from discouragement and an untimely retirement from the great battle in which Christianity is striving for the mastery, if we do not persistently give heed to that word. It must be study, of course, with a purpose—to "show ourselves workmen that need not be ashamed." Herein is a constant challenge to the best that is in us. We ought to become better able year by year to give a reason for the faith that is in us—a reason which we honestly think ought to commend itself to the best intelligence of the twentieth century, as well as to the average mind. Such an endeavor, rightly conceived and heroically pursued, would require such use of our minds as would inevitably strengthen them. Constant self-education as a self-saving discipline is what is urged here. President Burton of the University of Chicago said in a recent address:

> Every man who has received the measure of education represented by a university degree is under solemn obligation to continue the process of his education. It is a continual discovery of one's self and of one's world and a continual adjustment of one's self to one's world. All education is therefore, of necessity, self-education—an acquisition, not an inspiration.

Not only would response to this challenge result in an increase of intellectual power; it would doubtless lead to a clearer conception of the meaning and the implications of the message which we are commissioned to give to the world. A critic of the modern pulpit says that he can get more and better information on many of the subjects which ministers often advertise as subjects for pulpit discourse, from other sources—from the writings or lectures of men who have made special studies in these fields. There is, of course, something to be said for the occasional discussion of current topics from the pulpit, but I shall not stop to say that something now. We ought not to be wounded by this particular shaft of criticism. But if one could say truly that the preachers of this land are not giving men the best there is in religion, that men are not going to church because they can get more and better religious knowledge and inspiration elsewhere, then we stand convicted before the bar of God and men as unequal to our task or unfaithful to our calling. This writer does not believe that this can be truthfully said of the ministry generally. But does not our knowledge of ourselves compel us to admit that we need to seek, as for precious treasure, ever-fresh and vitalizing understandings of our message and ever-deepening convictions of its value? We talk about and believe in a simple gospel. But can we really preach this gospel so that our age will hear and heed it? To do that is so much more than citing texts, and reiterating phrases which are so familiar that they have lost their meaning—it is so much more than this that we may well tremble to undertake it. Yet, I fear, and I am here taking counsel of my own experience, that we are prone to take our task of understanding and declaring our message much too lightly.

I confess, too, to a fear that the pulpit has in recent years neglected the central themes of the gospel; that in our studies of phases of gospel truth in which we have become interested, such, for example, as the social gospel or some interpretation

of eschatology or some problem of criticism, or some Scripture reflection of historic background, that we have not sufficiently studied in the full light of human experience and of Scripture the great themes of religion. The real glory of the pulpit is the tremendous central message of the gospel. To know that more deeply, and to hold it with great conviction, requires that one be ever harvesting " the product of the deep furrow."

One of the newer books on the inexhaustible subject of preaching is from the pen of Principal Garvie of New College, London. Let me enforce what I have just said by quoting a weighty sentence from Doctor Garvie's Introduction:

> The common assumption in the Christian church is that preaching will not be the power and the wisdom of God unto the salvation of sinners and the perfecting of the saints unless the preacher is himself convinced, and can convince his hearers that he has a message from God to deliver, that his words are not of his own invention and imagination, but are by the inspiration of the Almighty who hath given him the understanding clearly to discern and rightly to divide the Word of Life.

We have a great message divinely given, and it ought to have our deepest loyalty and the service of all our powers for its proclamation. When I appeal for more study, it is with this end in view: that we shall develop the power to grasp with a new understanding the central facts and truths of our Christian faith; that with this fresh understanding of truth we may have begotten in us a consuming passion to make these truths known to the men and women of this intelligent, scientific, restless, and unsatisfied age, in a way that will compel them to hear, and persuade them to believe. This way lies the minister's salvation.

But let me go on to note that in this business of working out our ministerial salvation we must live up to the readily admitted fact that the spiritual man may be made stronger. The measure of the spiritual life of the minister, other things being equal, is the measure of his power with others in spiritual things. There are physical giants, and there are intellectual

giants. There are spiritual giants as well—Paul, Augustine, Spurgeon, Moody, Wayland. And among the men of our day one could name many who are representatives of different types of spiritual power—men who tower above their contemporaries in the things of the spiritual life. The spiritual giant is no accident, nor so by special favor of God. God is no respecter of persons. Every man according to his gift may develop a large measure of that spiritual life which spells power.

There is nothing final in the care and discipline of the body; it needs attention every day. There is nothing final in education; a man must be ever learning. There is no final spiritual experience. There are spiritual crises that will never be repeated; but there may be repeated crises, and there ought to be an ever-expanding soul life through fellowship with Christ. This is a prime condition of spiritual leadership.

If all of us in the ministry could be made to feel the force of this fact, who would deny that we would be at the gates of a way that would lead us into the promised land of new achievement in the spiritual realm? We are the exponents of a spiritual message which is intended to meet spiritual needs, and we shall fail in our mission unless we are ourselves spiritual.

In these ways in the ministry we must each save himself; if we would be saved from a gradual decline of prophetic power and usefulness, or if we would be saved from an untimely ministerial grave, and if we would be saved unto the joy of the thickening fight, we must work out our ministerial salvation. And that means that we must use, everlastingly, every endeavor to become worthy of the prophet's calling.

A vivid conception of the dignity and difficulty, the glory and worth of our work will help us toward a new power. Some years ago a visitor from across the waters whose name I cannot recall, quoted the following lines of Wordsworth, addressed to the artist Haydon, and pointed out that they applied with equal force to the Christian ministry:

High is our calling, friend; creative art,
Whether the instrument of words she use,
Or pencil pregnant with ethereal hues,
Demands the service of a mind and heart
Though sensitive, yet in their weakest part
Heroically fashioned. . .
And, oh! when nature sinks, as oft she may,
Still to be strenuous of the bright reward
And in the soul admit of no decay,
Brook no continuance of weak-mindedness;
Great is the glory, for the strife is hard.

Let me conclude, then, by reminding ourselves that the Christian ministry is indispensable to the progress of the kingdom of God and the welfare of the world; that the character and power of that ministry is a vital concern of us all; that leakage and wastage ought to be reduced to a minimum; that reenforcements ought, intelligently and diligently, to be sought; that the highest ideals of the ministerial calling ought to be maintained; that all that is best in the minister ought to be conserved and developed.

It is ours, as individual ministers, to save ourselves unto the best that is in us; it is ours as a brotherhood to save one another. It is ours, also, to help the churches to develop that sort of church life which will furnish recruits for the ministry, and likewise, create the material, social, and spiritual conditions which will conserve and develop the present-day ministry, so that it shall rise to new heights of power, and win new victories for Christ whose servants we are.

# THE ANGELS OF MONS

## A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY

GEORGE BARTON CUTTEN
President of Colgate University

CONDITIONS in the recent war were ripe for extraordinary psychical experiences. Hostilities had barely started before various startling psychic phenomena began to appear, prominent and early among these being the " Angels of Mons." Probably no phenomenon of religious psychology of recent times has been so wide-spread and marked in its results as this, and especially remarkable was the diversity of opinion in England regarding the story. Some thought that with regard to those who believed in the objective reality of the phenomenon,

> It would strengthen their religious faith, which has been greatly weakened by the war, and would reinforce belief in the justice of the cause for which so many men fell during that magnificent retreat, and almost miraculous recovery on the banks of the Marne.

Others, however, feared a return to superstition, by which religion would retrograde centuries, and by which democracy would be dearly bought. Among other objects of controversy in connection with this experience, is that of origin; and one journalist, who wrote a most dramatic and moving tale about the retreat from Mons, has been sufficiently bold to shoulder the whole responsibility for its angels. Mr. Arthur Machen, in a letter to *The Evening News* (London) tells of a short story called " The Bowman " published in the same journal on September 29, 1914, about one month after the retreat from Mons. His own story is as follows:

> Some time in last September, I was thinking of the terrible and heroic retreat from Mons. It is many years since I have told a tale, but somehow there was a fire in that history that burned in me, and

made me wish that I could celebrate it in some poor fashion. And so the tale of "The Bowmen" came into my head. Very, very briefly, it is the story of the British troops at the point of agony and despair, hopelessly outnumbered in men and guns. One of our soldiers invokes the help of the champion of England, St. George. St. George brings up the spirits of the Agincourt bowmen in array, and the German host is annihilated by their ghostly arrows. That is all. It was quite a simple, ordinary little legend of the battle-field, and I wrote it and dismissed it, and wished I could have made it better. I may say, once for all, that I had heard no kind or sort of rumor of any spiritual intervention during the retreat from Mons, nor any faintest echo of such rumor. "The Bowmen," as printed in *The Evening News,* was invention as much as any story can be invention. Everybody would have it that the tale was true. The clergy said so. The army said so. The occultists said so. All sorts of vague authorities—"an officer," "a soldier," "a correspondent"—were quoted to show that the incident of spiritual intervention, or something very like it, had actually happened. The names of these witnesses were not given.

This would seem to settle the matter and stamp its origin as pure fiction, but fiction so appealing to certain innate desires, as to be repeated and objectified by the readers of the *News.* Those, however, who have investigated the matter claim that the stories were widely current in France at the actual time of the retreat from Mons, a month before this journalist told his story.

Mr. Ralph Shirley, editor of *The Occult Review,* collected a number of affidavits from men who were actually present at Mons, and claimed to have seen the vision. The content of the vision varies with the different people. Few seem to have beheld the bowmen, but many saw angels with wings; others saw St. George mounted on his charger, and still others seem to have seen only a bright flash. The French soldiers who saw the vision at Mons, beheld not St. George, but Joan of Arc. All agree, however, that the moment the vision appeared the German onslaught received a check. The German horses could be seen rearing and plunging, and ceasing to advance, and the hard-pressed French and English were saved. Some,

in fact, know nothing of the vision and assert that the German line was really held up at Mons for no apparent reason.

If the emotional pressure is considerable, and intense concentration of attention is present, then suggestion completes the trio which fulfill the necessary conditions for vision.

The emotional strain, which masses of men undergo in the heat of battle, is hardly understood by civilians, but is recognized by all military leaders. On this account all military training is directed to controlling and mastering the instincts to which the mass is prone. If this could be predicated of former wars and battles, how much more of the late war! So great was the strain, that this became on the western front a white man's war, for no other than white men's nerves could stand it, and black and yellow races were either transferred to labor battalions, or sent to other fronts. The first of the two which are prerequisites for visions (emotional pressure) was undoubtedly present at Mons. The second one—that of intense concentration of attention—would also be present. With the strain of the battle, the smoke, and the flashes, it would be far easier to make angels, or any other figures, out of the appearance of the sky than out of the bed of coals in the fireplace so frequently used as a basis for our creative imaginations. One could not conceive of any other condition in connection with that wonderful retreat than that of concentrated attention. The third factor is that of suggestion. As for definite suggestions at that particular time, it would be difficult to discover, but frequently some chance remark flies through the crowd like wild-fire, and is sufficient to fulfil the condition; but it is not necessary to depend upon that. Our race still has its primitive substratum which the war so clearly demonstrated as not so deeply below the surface. In all times of great hardship and severe strain it seems so much easier, and withal so natural, as indeed it is, to call for and to depend upon superhuman help, than to do the work ourselves and to solve our

own difficulties. How much more glorious in the eyes of some to be helped by angels, than to use inspired men? It is a primitive conception, and one which rushes to the surface wherever overwhelming conditions obtain. At such times it is difficult to remember that since Jesus' hands were bound and he was led away to his trial, the only hands he has on earth are our hands, and the only feet he has are our feet, and unless we do for him the work remains undone. Human heroes, not angel heroes, must stay the Germans.

> There's not a village in the Kentish weald,
> There's not a hamlet hid in Sussex downs,
> There's not a reeking, smoke-bound Northern town,
> Nor Cornish village sweet with sea and field
> That does not wait for God to stand revealed
> This day of days; and wrong to right shall yield.

> It matters not just how this miracle may fall,
> Whether across the Calais way a band of angels stand
> With sword in hand; or whether with their backs against the wall
> Our sweating, swearing, struggling heroes stand—
> The greatest, truest miracle of all.

It is conceivable that there might be individual visions; but does not the fact that many persons saw the same vision indicate that there must have been objective reality back of it? It will be remembered that while many claim to have seen the vision, the content of the visions varied with the individual, as is always the case, according to the training and beliefs of the individual concerning it. This is seen in the fact that while the English saw St. George, the French saw Joan of Arc. We must not, however, forget the influence of the crowd upon the individual. Col. F. N. Maude, in writing on "The Jena Campaign," says:

> The psychological fact remains that, in moments of intense excitement, all except the very strongest characters cease to think or act as free agents; but are absolutely dominated by the resultant will-power

of the "crowd," to which they for the moment belong; and this resultant will-power of the mass will always revert to the primitive instinct of the race.

As noted above, one of the most primitive instincts of the race is that of objective divine aid, and it is most natural that the crowning influence at this time would be toward such a vision. The crusaders saw St. George on the walls of Jerusalem; this vision was, according to tradition, witnessed by the whole army. Under the conditions, especially with the traditions concerning St. George, and the memory which Tommy Atkins had of him on the reverse side of the sovereign, it is not strange that many describe the vision as that of the patron saint in golden armor. Altogether, we might well believe that the angels of Mons were real experiences on the part of the soldiers, and we might prognosticate such visions had we previously known the conditions.

The angels of Mons, while the most widely known of the visions, was not unique; and many other visions were reported, and many stories of charms, signs, and premonitions were told. When "the call" came to a man death was practically sure, although some thought it might be side-tracked by a charm such as a gold piece. Many soldiers relate tales of their comrades announcing "the call" and death following, sometimes by sheer accident on a quiet front. The superstition that the third man to light a cigarette from the same match was doomed, continued to the end. As in similar cases, when these premonitions or signs came true they were related, and the story was spread widely, but when they failed, nothing was said about them.

It might be well for us to note one other vision which was frequently seen and often mentioned. This was called "The White Comrade." Both French and English profess to have had this vision, but it was more individual than that of the angels of Mons. "The White Comrade" made his appearance after every severe engagement and succored the

wounded, and especially the dying. Out between the lines where no man could go, and if he went, where he could not live, "The White Comrade" moved to and fro over the field, going from one wounded soldier to another. Snipers used him for a target, shells exploded near him, but nothing harmed him as he moved calmly about helping the wounded. A story, which gained wide circulation, tended to extend interest in "The White Comrade." One wounded man relates that after being hit, he recovered consciousness and found a man dressed in white ministering to him. He thought at first that a peasant in his frock was there. He lost consciousness and awakened in a cave where he had been borne. As he watched "The White Comrade," he noticed a wound in his hand from which a drop of blood fell, and said to his companion, "Oh, you've been wounded too!" and his companion answered, "Oh, this is an old wound." Then a look at his companion's feet disclosed wounds there, and only then did he know who "The White Comrade" was. This incident has been beautifully set forth by Martha Elvira Pettus as follows:

The battle? Ay, the battle has been dire,
My captain shot to death: his dying sigh,
His parting words I heard above the fire
And the guns' thunder: his last low "good-bye"——

"No war in heaven, brother." Then he smiled
And died. While I (the pang no words can tell)
First knew that I was wounded: anguish wild
Clutched me with iron hand, and then—I fell.

Yes, I have seen the vision. That dark night
When all the world seemed vanishing in flame.
Wounded, I lay upon the ground—my sight
Striving to pierce that blackness; then, he came.

The One who walks the field of Death and Night—
Who bends down to the dying: his eyes meet
The closing eyes: his touch, his arm is might—
Nor Death, nor darkness, check those coming feet.

I hear the rifle-shots, the bullets groan
Fast through the air. On him they have no power.
He speaks—his arms outstretched, "If thou hadst known
Thy peace . . . 'tis hidden from thine eyes, this hour."

And he was close beside me—comrade, friend—
Gently his hand had touched my throbbing breast:
All pain was gone, all terror at an end.
Soon, gathered in his arms, I lay at rest.

He carried me where ran a mountain stream.
He washed my wounds, bound them with tender care.
I strove to speak my thanks—so poor they seem!
But he spoke not; his hands were clasped in prayer.

The while he prayed, a drop of crimson blood
Fell slowly from his hands. I cried in pain:
"Whence are these wounds that pierce thy hands, my friend?"
"An old wound, yes," he said, "but keen again."

And then I saw the blessed sign—he bore
Upon his feet the cruel crimson, too.
I had not known—*I had not known, before,*
But when I saw his wounded feet—I knew.

Friend of the dying! Is it not like thee
To stand beside us, in our deadliest woe?
Ah, when our eyes thy radiant presence see
Our hearts cry out, "We will not let thee go!"

No, in the darkest battle-hour, be sure
Brother, tho' sorely stricken, do not fear;
He's by thy side. Know this: thou canst endure—
All is not lost. Our Comrade will appear.

There, on the dreadful field, among the slain
Bending above the wounded, drawing nigh
To every passing soul; comforting pain,
Yes, we have seen Him. We fear not to die.

The explanation given in connection with the angels of Mons is applicable to this vision, the conditions of one being as favorable to visions as that of the other, and after the story once started, then after each engagement expectation would be an additional causal factor.

# THE CHURCH AND THE GOSPEL

SPENSER B. MEESER
Crozer Theological Seminary

One of the questions emphasized by the World War incidents is, Has the church correctly understood and wisely administered her trust in the gospel of Jesus Christ?

We say "wisely administered," for there is no reason here to question either the honesty or sincerity in the ministry of Christianity. Nor do we mean to intimate the failure of Christianity. It is trite, but still timely, to say that Christianity has not yet had a fair trial. The moral and spiritual supremacy of Jesus Christ is for us indisputable. Our failures to reach his level judge us, but do not discredit his ideals. He remains the transcendent, the moral and religious Absolute. In morals and religion Jesus has all the values and the preeminence of God. Nor yet again is it purposed to hint that those whose case is herein cited were, in any sense, more culpable, indeed, either worse or better than the average of church-members. Nevertheless, of the Church's failure rightly to understand and correctly to administer the gospel of Jesus Christ, so as to adjust her ministry to the problem of salvation from sin, there may be serious reasons for inquiry.

Here is a fact, for instance, which for some of us aroused a hope, but which in its issue gave additional reason for serious doubt as to the values of the present conception and ministry of the gospel by the churches. The fact is this: There went forth into the armies of our nation from the membership of our Christian churches, from the culture of our Christian faith and the nurture of our Christian homes, a multitude of Christian young men, to the number of probably five hundred thousand. They went forth to the highest forms of stern discipline, within the most rigid conceivable safe-

guards, and under uplifting and supposedly inspiring motives, to mingle in most intimate fellowship with the vast body of the young men of the nation not connected with the churches.

From every point of view of the church's endeavor to evangelize the young manhood of the country this seemed an ideal situation. Here was abundant leaven to leaven the whole lump. Here were hundreds of thousands of torch-bearers to flood the camps and battle-fields with the light of Jesus Christ. Here was a cloud of witnesses sufficient to carry irresistible conviction of the superiority of the Christian life and ideals. Here was potential faith, theoretically at least, enough to infect the whole army with the enthusiasms of Jesus Christ.

In these ideal conditions of contact created by the situation, it would seem that there was the supreme chance for the Christian young manhood to win the manhood of the nation to Christ, and to dominate the situation with Christian principle and character. But what resulted from this situation? Even yet it is too early to determine the total result of this contact of the Christian young men with their fellows in the army. To say that no good came to the army would suggest a result too lamentable to consider; and would be untrue, false to every evidence presented by the high character of the army in France, said to be unqualifiedly the highest ever achieved in any war, by any army, of any nation. Nor would it be gracious or wise or fair to suggest that such an issue is probably the final outcome.

What we have in mind is that, at once upon their initiation into service, the churches were called on to put forth all their resources to protect these darlings of the church from their new environment; and in thousands of homes, heart-breaking concern bowed devoted parents and friends in anxiety lest they fall morally by the way. Instead of being regarded as moral and religious dynamic, such as our faith had ideally considered them; instead of presenting a vigorous idealism as

their Christian culture would suggest; instead of a host of militant evangelizers, they were considered a fresh and heavy responsibility on the church. Was the church's fear a confession of her sense of the inadequacy of her ministry of the gospel, "the power of God"?

Let us admit that these young men were thrust into unusual conditions and unwonted manner of life; that the stress of war and the soldier's exacting tasks are not especially conducive to Christian life; and that the temptations of army life are both novel, many, and strenuous. But all the profession and promise of our religion is that its faith and culture is the moral equipment that prepares men for just such issues, and armors them for just such combats with evil. The question seems justified, Why, if our Christian faith, training, and culture are a correct ministry of the gospel—why did these men not become a virile, vigorous, and victorious moral and redemptive force, instead of an increased responsibility? For what and to what end were they converted and trained? Why should not these young men have become centers of converting force, dynamos of spiritual power, moral powerhouses? And why for their sakes was it necessary to send hosts of organized Christian workers? If they needed this concern and supplementary effort, if the situation demanded it and our work for them and with them in the churches left them in need of the service—why of course!

*But that is the point*—that is the point which justifies the question, Has our Christian ministry, its understanding of the gospel, its training and culture, been true to the reality and moral intent of the gospel? If it has, then the gospel would seem to be neither the wisdom nor the power of God.

This situation is, of course, not peculiar to these young men, and these remarks are not especially a challenge of their faith. The same results are found in the ordinary experience of the church at home. It is the challenge of Christ and his ideal to the common achievement of the Christian church.

Why, if our ministry is true to the reality in the gospel, are our converts not better fitted to the tasks of noble living and world evangelization? This concrete, specific, and conspicuous instance simply brings the general situation more forcibly to attention.

In quality of character, in force of influence, in moral leadership, and in religious power the churches seem often to be losing out; and as though leadership in the spiritual life had already passed to a new center in the university and college. The consuming passion of enthusiasm, the central fire of self-sacrifice flames more furiously in great social and economic movements than in the church undertakings; and the world looks more often to leaders in those movements for human welfare than to ministers and church for an understanding of the word, and an expression of the spirit of Jesus Christ. Sometimes one hesitates before the threat of Jesus to the Jews of his day, lest its imprecation be about to fall on the church—"The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Every local church faces the fact, and feels the depression of its relative impotence in the community in which it is placed. Possessed of wealth, some social influence, generally magnificent physical equipment, able preachers, the accessories of music and culture, nevertheless its progress in Christian conquest of the community is painfully inefficient and slow. And when we come to the great cities the inefficiency of some of the churches is simply appalling.

What is the usual method and goal of Christian effort and culture by the churches? To what end do they conceive their work to be directed? How do they understand Jesus Christ and what it was that he sought? To what end did he live, teach, die on the cross, and live again? Are the churches satisfied that they have infallibly gotten the mind of Jesus? Are they satisfied that their ideals are true to the gospel and wisely directed?

We can here do little more than suggest what may be enrichment of Christian faith and culture such as would correct the indicated poverty in understanding and power. Its complements must be thought out and worked in by the wisdom of the common experience of many. What is here offered is not presented, therefore, as a final statement of the complete understanding and values of the gospel of Jesus Christ, but as a means of raising the question whether there are any overlooked, ignored, or neglected elements of the gospel in our present-day preaching. So by way of suggestion we raise the question, What is the gospel?—meaning as to its explicit content and its implications; and the gospel, both as presented by Jesus and as his followers interpreted it for their age and problems. We assume continuity of content through the many presentations of the gospel.

In general terms we may say that the gospel is, that Jesus Christ is come to be the Saviour of men. So he proclaimed, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save,"—"came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." We can not understand Jesus and his life until he is conceived as Saviour, for so he conceived himself and to this end directed his life, teaching, and service. Practically all recognize this fact. In this we have unity of thought. But in what salvation consists, what men are to be saved from, and how he saves have been the problems of theology since the twelfth century. It is of this richer, fuller content of the gospel we think now; those postulates and implicits of the Good News which may be overlooked, not to say ignored, or even contradicted in theory.

## I. The Good News About God

The underlying, basal word in the gospel is concerning the nature of God as revealed in Jesus—God is good; in himself and in his will toward men; God loves.

Explicitly this is rarely denied. As a single unrelated doctrine it is *ac*claimed and *pro*claimed; but as a primal regu-

lative fact, in the light of which all the rest of the gospel must be interpreted, it is often ignored; and, in some theories of salvation, it is implicitly contradicted. This gospel of God is something men have wished were true, but which they have not yet believed; or have not had the faith to apply consistently in their theories. The obsession of the human mind by pagan ideas of God almost uniformly deflects the current of thought, and seriously unethical views of the service of Christ in salvation are maintained by appeals to ideas of God which are the negations of this gospel. Ascribing their vices to God, under names, moral in intent, such as "Justice," he has been represented and understood in ways grossly repulsive to every fine moral sense.

We owe to Jesus this, more than anything else, the good news that God is good, merciful, fair in judgment, redemptive in purpose, gracious, forgiving, good or righteous in the highest moral sense; that he wills no ill to men; that he longs for and wills the moral good of men; that he loves, not hates; seeks to save, not destroy; is Friend, not enemy; and requires for their acceptance with him only that they abandon sin and do righteousness.

In some vague way all men recognize this as content, explicit or implicit, of the gospel; but the survival of pagan ideas, or the bias of theological theories of atonement beclouds the mind; impossible character—ethically impossible—is ascribed to God; worship takes on pagan features; eschatological doctrines assume forms whose implicits are discreditable to God; while fear, revolt, and moral resentment are awakened in men's minds.

## II. The Good News About Man

But there is another element in this good news.

As the first word of the gospel is concerned with God, the second is about man. That is to be expected, since religion involves both the person and action of God and the reciprocal

persons and actions of men. These two are the primary factors of religion.

The second word of the gospel is the good news of the infinite worth and significance of our human life to God. Theological training of an earlier day required the postulate of man's worthlessness as well as native depravity. The grace of God was to be seen in his love for those unworthy of it, a not very rational conception to apply to God and contradicted in the effort of God in Jesus Christ. The gospel says man *is worth* saving, and his salvation is a challenge to the wisdom as well as love of God. It is thus that the teaching and redemptive service of Jesus is to be understood. So great pain and sorrow, so great condescension and service, so great sacrifice can mean only the vast significance of human life to God, or else the folly and futility of the Author of it all.

With too many apparently good reasonings from the facts of the universe, man seems often of no more moment to God than any other fact or phenomenon in the series which make up the universe. The theory of organic evolution was at first so interpreted; and men said that if the theory were true, then man is no more to God than the wild-cat, and his prayer no more appealing than the howl of the hyena. Second thought has brought just the opposite view, now a commonplace of a critical consideration of the facts. Man is now seen, in the light of this revelation, to be the crown and goal of all the universe processes; the aim and supreme purpose of God; and the most worthful of all existences, since he is the climax of all cosmic activity through inconceivable years. Yes! and as such his immortal continuing is vastly more assured.

The same thought occurred to the Psalmist. "What is man?" he wrote, "when I consider the universe, the sun, moon and stars which thou hast ordained . . ." But note that he affirms the spiritual significance of man. God is mindful of him, visits him; made him only a little lower than God;

crowns him with glory and honor, and gives dominion over the works of his hand. In a word, over against all the apparent insignificance of man when viewed as part of the physical universe, the Psalmist asserts the fact of man's transcendence and his spiritual preeminence. He says, in effect, that man is to be measured not by the size and mass of the universe, nor by the mightiness of its forces; neither by geological ages nor astronomical distances; but by his moral and spiritual capacities, by the values God put upon him, by which alone God's interest and love for him can be made rational.

And the gospel of Jesus brings clearly into view this conception of man's value to God. In all his teaching directly and indirectly Jesus represents this fact. In the Sermon on the Mount, in parable, or in other didactic forms of revelation, as well as in his services to man, Jesus stresses the value of man's life to himself and to God. He tells them they are of more value than many sparrows; that man is more than the institution of the Sabbath; that the Father is "on the lookout" for the returning "prodigal," and "goes out" to entreat the vicious and jealous elder brother. Nowhere, in any word, does he imply or openly counsel that men should think of themselves as "worms of the dust," corrupt and unworthy to God; but quite freely bids them think of each other as children of God and even calls them friends. Nowhere does he imply, even, that they are contemptible to God; but openly reminds them that they are of supreme moment to him. He asks no one to abject himself before God, but to look up to him in confidence and joy.

Jesus thus not only shows us what God is like, but what man is in his essential spiritual capacities and worth; and makes clear what man may become— a thing incredible except for the inherent moral power in man's spirit. It would be a poor basis for faith in Jesus' saving service for us, and poor compliment to the wisdom and ethical value of it, if it were true that he died for those of no more moment to God than swine, or worms

of the dust. Equally basal with the gospel of God is this gospel of man's supreme value to God, else the story of God's love and the tragedy of the Cross would be a pitiable farce.

### III. The Good News About the Individual Man

Not altogether different but needing clear recognition is the good news of God's interest in, and care for, the individual; what we may call the Gospel of the Individual Man.

This is the ground and fundament of Christ's or any other gospel. If God is careful only for the type and careless of the individual, if it is the race and not the man he loves, some few persons, highly sophisticated in social ethics may find comfort and motive in the outlook; but personal life in the individual will seem cheap and scarcely worth the struggle. Sentiments of race or social perpetuation may carry through some who dwell in the rarified atmosphere of social academics; but most men will find small inspiration in being the mere victims of social progress.

The gospel is the good news that God loves the lowly, the humble, the suffering, and the miserable; that he will exalt and bless them in his care for and interest in the individual. No philosophy before or since, no religion either, has been so essentially democratic or proposed that God cared for the weak and distressed. Such were believed to be the objects of God's displeasure or contempt, a conception not yet wholly dissipated. In these respects Jesus' teaching is full and explicit. The Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes in particular, bear indisputably his conviction of this studious interest of the heavenly Father in each person; while Jesus persistently set himself against the current notion that suffering, poverty, and pain are the signs of God's indifference, or the penalty of insignificance. In every particular, the gospel of Christ is the good news of the Father's intimate relation to individual men, a word of salvation from all ills, culminating in a blessed immortality for each and all.

Indeed the " salvation of the soul " is based on this fact. Jesus' life and service, his death and resurrection, as constituting his redemptive service, are direct and primary affirmations of the divine love and care for the individual man. It is the dynamic factor in religion. It is this which gives moral and spiritual meaning to God for man, and is essentially the reason man has interest of a regulating value in his life and character here and his destiny hereafter. Whatever may have been the case in primitive religion, or in early Judaism, since Jesus, the energy and creative force in religion has been this factor in the gospel of Christ.

Politically, we have seen the issue of this gospel in democracy; for the basis and justifying cause of democracy is the dignity and worth to God of each individual; his equality before God with all, and the accessibility of God to each and all. Modernly we call this gospel by the name " Democracy," which being interpreted, means that before God all are equal, to all God is equally accessible, with all God is directly in touch, and none can keep another from God or his grace. The Magna Charta of Democracy, and the Magna Charta of religion alike, is this doctrine, this gospel of God's interest in and care for the individual which makes access to God equal for all.

## IV. The Good News of the Kingdom

Another element of the gospel, beginning to have proper emphasis and practise, is the good news that the service which God requires of men is their service of each other—the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, or the Gospel of Brotherhood. This is the gospel in its social implication.

Modernly the Gospel of the Kingdom has been interpreted almost exclusively in economic or industrial categories; as though life were not more than meat. These are of course part of the content of the social implicits of the gospel; but they are not all, nor are they the supreme aspects of it. It is to be regretted that the spiritual and intellectual applications

of it have not been stressed; for the interpretations of the apostles make the gospel of the kingdom to be something more than the good news of higher wages, or better conditions of life for the working man. It means these finally; but its premise is a spiritual attitude and a moral temper. These latter are root and trunk of the tree, and the economic issues are the fruit.

The gospel of the kingdom is primarily this: Men serve God best, and realize the kingdom, by right, just, charitable, and equal action to their fellows; not by building cathedrals, offering sacrifices, making prayers, celebrating feasts, observing days, giving money—not even by ecstatic feelings, and other-worldly states of mind. Deeds of justice, truth, righteousness, and mercy are the forces for the achieving of the kingdom.

This is gospel or good news in two senses: It puts the sanction and power of religion on what is human and moral rather than on forms and institutions. It encourages men to expect of the religious and all who mean to serve God, that they will treat their fellows fairly; that they will not lie to those who trust them; that they will not defraud but will give men their just due; that they will be kind, merciful, patient, and considerate of all, instead of merely demanding they tithe mint and cummin, go to church, accept a creed, engage in prayer, sing psalms of praise to God, while they are content with injustice and wrongs.

The wronged and oppressed, the poor and diseased, the humble and lonely, the sufferer of injustice and loss at the hands of their religious fellows—all these will have hope that, if religion be as Jesus conceived and practised it, they may yet receive of men what now they so often fail to receive. Religion will be seen to be human and near, practical and beneficent, in the whole range of life.

But such a gospel is good news also because this word makes religion concrete, within reach of daily practise, and

possible to understand. Many of the teachings of Christianity are simply confusing to men, many of its practises are indistinguishable from mere Oriental mysticisms. Their moral value and their spiritual significance is vague.

Multitudes, who would worship God, have no difficulty in understanding and appreciating moral service, deeds of benevolence and justice, equal rights and duties, clean mind, pure heart, neighborliness, helpfulness to others, righteousness. Jesus Christ as example and *power* for a right life can be understood by those who are bewildered by " the gospel " which is merely a way of being " saved " from moral retribution, while the life is unchanged and the deeds of a vicious heart continue. The gospel of Christ is the good news that the service of our fellow men is the service and worship of God, for which there are no substitutes. " God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in *rectitude.*" God is a moral God, and the only way to worship him " in truth " is in the truth of true living, as it is seen in Jesus Christ.

## V. The Good News About Forgiveness and the Saviourhood of Jesus

Based on the gospel of God's goodness, the worth of man, God's care for the individual man, and the moral nature of worship or religion, is the good news of the free, sovereign forgiveness of God.

By " free and sovereign " is meant that God's forgiveness is not dependent on, derived from, or procured by the will or action of any other person; but is the spontaneous outreach of his own nature. God is, in his nature, a redeeming God; not an avenger. The message of Hebrew and all other prophets, in all ages, is that God is moved by holy love, by altruistic concern as of a father to children; that he bears in himself the wounds of human sin, without losing love. He is the great Altruist, moved not by concern for his own glory, or even for

the vindication of the moral law; but by concern for man's moral good.

Therefore God, as the issue and consequence, the expression and demonstration of his holy love, gives Jesus Christ, his Son; endows, appoints, commissions him, to realize, achieve, make effective in man his sovereign, free forgiveness. Therefore, Jesus has come to save men from sin, in the only way any one can be saved from sin, viz., by assuring them, in his life, his love, and his death on the cross, of the "grace-full," free forgiveness of God; and by his moral and spiritual power as indwelling spirit in their hearts. Jesus Christ is the "Agent" of God come to make good in man what God has freely granted. Thus is he Saviour, the wisdom and power, the love and forgiveness of God, at work in man to save him from sin.

There is no overemphasis of this. It is the alternate and negative of the theories which make *Jesus* only a penal substitute-victim of man's sin; and see salvation only in his sacrificial death, to which *his life* and his *life-again* are but incidental preliminary and consequence; and to which his *abiding spiritual presence and power* are not related.

Men have variously conceived Jesus Christ and his gospel. They have believed that, by his death he becomes a ransom price paid to Satan, for buying back captives of sin. Or, as the chivalrous Knight of Heaven he rendered satisfaction to God for his affronted honor, so averting the vengeance of God and winning forgiveness. Or as a reservoir of accumulated merit, on which men could draw; through the sacraments, for the Roman Catholic; through faith, for the Protestant. Or as a legal victim to satisfy the demand of "justice," so men might be justified by faith. Or as a sacrifice to appease the wrath of God, and incline him to forgive. Or as a winning exhibition of love; and so an appeal of God to men to repent. Or as a righteous and appointed Head of an elect few, to whom his worth is imputed. Or as a public showing

of God's displeasure at sin, justifying a God of righteousness in forgiving sin.

In the current view, the gospel is that Jesus Christ, *by his death,* has made provision by which men can escape *the penalty* of their sin; that penalty being thought of as eternal torment in exile from God. And this is the understanding which many have of a group of Bible passages; though, of course, no exact or explicit teaching to this intent can be found in the Bible.

In the view of this interpretation, very broadly and generally the work of the church is thought to be " to save souls." By salvation is meant that men be brought into some sacramental or faith relation to Jesus Christ, such as will avert the penalty of sin—the perdition of suffering called hell—which is the destiny of the unsaved. To this end, men are urged to accept Christ, and called on to make what is named " decision," by which it is believed men come into this relation. Thereupon they are assured that they are " safe for eternity." After which, as in other instances, " the convert " is left, in the joy of a new-found faith, to make his way as best he may. It is hoped that no one will think this description a caricature of the method. It is intended to be reverent. Upon such a presentation of the gospel the writer came into the Christian life.

Presumably, he is to live decently and morally; but such living is not represented as any essential part of his salvation. Jesus Christ as Saviour from sin itself; Jesus as moral wisdom and power to overcome sin; and salvation from sin as the only salvation from penalty, is hardly presented. The idea of salvation comes to be that it is a legal transaction, in which the painful death of Jesus Christ is accepted instead of the sinner's suffering, as the penalty of his sin. No idea is given, or only later suggested, of the redemptive worth of the moral struggle and triumph, or of the meaning of the victory over sin to salvation itself. Nor is the obligation of the convert to seek

the redemption of others made clear and indubitable. We plead with them to do it; but leave them expecting that their failure does not impair the integrity of their own salvation. Salvation is viewed as a goal instead of being seen as a starting-point. The individual is led to think of himself as the "terminus ad quem" rather than the "terminus a quo" of salvation. To be saved by another rather than to be a saving force in the world is the idea begotten.

What preparation does such a discipline give the convert for the practical hard realities of life's struggle? It promises salvation from sin's penalty in the future, on the basis of compliance with formal conditions which are without moral significance or force; but has relatively little inspiration or power for the struggle in the present. So that whatever may be one's judgment of the correctness of such an interpretation of the Biblical teaching it may be urged that it is but a partial understanding of the gospel, and taken alone may even mislead men.

In the aspect of a "salvation" the gospel is that Jesus Christ is come and comes ever to make good in man the free forgiveness of God; comes in the historic order, comes again to abide in the moral and spiritual order. Comes in the historical order to make God's free forgiveness real and concrete in the realm where men sin and are lost. Comes in the moral and spiritual order to make forgiveness spiritually real and dynamic in the hearts and souls of men.

He makes God's free forgiveness good, real, and concrete in the historical order by actually living the love of God; by actually practising the forgiveness of God, as on the cross he cries, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do"; by actually being true to the right, even to the suffering of the cross; by actually living, not simply declaring, God's judgment on sin, bearing its actual result in death.

He comes again to dwell in our hearts by faith; and in this makes forgiveness real and dynamic in the souls of men. In this manner he is "the wisdom of God and the power of

God," "the power of God unto salvation," transforming our minds, cleansing our hearts, turning men from sin to goodness. He is thus the One who is able to save to the uttermost; the very power of God unto salvation.

The gospel of Jesus Christ as Saviour is then the good news of the One who *by moral and spiritual power saves men from sin,* and in saving from sin saves from sin's retribution. Often the gospel is presented as the good news of One who saves us from God—from his wrath, his justice. In so doing such teaching virtually maligns, as it misrepresents the nature and character of God. The gospel of Jesus, of Peter, John, Paul, is of One who by his incarnation, his *life,* his *teaching,* his *transforming personality,* his *ministry of doing good,* his *sufferings and death,* his *resurrection* and *indwelling in human hearts,* saves men from sin and sin's blight; and as Agent of God expresses and achieves in men the will and love of God; reconciles us to the Father and becomes the enabling power of God for a right life in relation to him and to our fellow men.

This comprehensive gospel may not appear as a facile instrument for revival meetings and evangelistic endeavor. It does not at once appear to lend itself to such forms of Christian service. But that it has or is such a message will appear upon reflection. Jesus as Saviour from sin ought to be glad, good news. Jesus, as a present power of God unto salvation, the assurance of forgiveness and love in God, is himself the gospel.

Furthermore, the method of the gospel's presentation and our Christian nurture must become increasingly educational, and the principles and disciplines of the school must be our guides. "Disciples," learners, he called his followers; "Master," teacher, they found in him.

Of course we do not mean the sheerly intellectual equipment. Education is more than intellectual. It aims at right thinking, it is true; but, just as truly, it aims at enriched feeling and right willing. It is only the education in this fuller

cultural sense, which develops the total personality and challenges the full round of powers, that can rightly be called education. The Christian life is a vocation and a task, a calling and an achievement; and it needs for its better accomplishment the vocational education, that is, a culture that will fit the Christian for living as Jesus Christ lived—a training embracing not only information and ideals, but a training that calls all the faculties into play, in schools of practise, in moral workshops. In this Jesus is the Master-Teacher, as he is first the Master-Saviour.

# SOME ASPECTS OF A YOUNG MINISTER'S FAITH

REV. HAROLD C. PHILLIPS
Mount Vernon, New York

WHAT are some aspects or tendencies of faith which are helping to guide and to influence the thinking of the modern minister?

## I

I mention three of these aspects. Today ministers of the gospel have a faith firmly grounded in the God-given origin of all truth. And if all truth comes from one source—namely, God—then in all truth there must be essential harmony, not discord; agreement, not contradiction. God cannot be divided against himself. To the modern minister there is only one God, and he is the source of all truth, "By him," as Paul says, "all things consist."

Now this may seem a very logical and simple assumption, and yet how many truly believe it? If men in the past had believed that, the history of the Christian movement would be different. If men today believed it, all the efforts that are being made to protect the truth that is contained in the Bible, for instance, from the truth that is being discovered in other realms, would be silenced, for truth never needs to be protected against truth. And the minister who worships a God that is big enough to be the source of all truth could, at least, say what Gamaliel said to the chief priests, when they were afraid of the heresy of the early apostles. God is all truth, and in truth there can be no contradictions.

This conception of the relation of God to all truth inevitably affects one's view of the Bible. The Bible, without any exception, is the most valuable thing that one possesses. If the writer views it differently from some others, it is not because he loves or treasures it any the less.

Now how does this view of God, as being the source of all truth, affect one's view of the Bible? It is said that Abraham Lincoln was once told that Charles Sumner did not believe the Bible, and Lincoln replied, "That's because he did not write it!" The young minister believes that the Bible contains the truth about God, but not all the truth. God is greater than the Bible, even as he is greater than our hearts. He was not born when the first chapter of Genesis was written, nor did he die when the writer of the Revelation said, "Amen." As St. Augustine says, "God did not make the world and then run away." The psalmist gives the true picture when he writes, God is "from everlasting to everlasting." God, if you please, has many Bibles. Modern scholars are deciphering his records on the rocks, just as truly as did Moses his record on the tables of stone. One is reminded of the fine distinction made by Coleridge when he remarked that there were two ways of viewing the Bible. One was to say that "the Bible contains the religion revealed by God"—to which we all subscribe, and the other, "Whatever is contained in the Bible is religion and was revealed by God"—which is something else.

Let me cite briefly the classic example which illustrates this point. I am referring to the age-long struggle so called between "science" and "religion." How fruitless has it been, and is, and is it not due to the failure of recognizing the oneness, the harmony of all truth? You have, perhaps, heard of the Christian missionary who was speaking to a Mohammedan sheik. The missionary told him that the world was round. "No," replied the sheik, "that cannot be, for the Koran states that the world is flat." "But," replied the missionary, "I know that the world is round, for I have traveled around it." To which the sheik replied, "Well, we will put it this way—geographically speaking, the world is round, but religiously speaking, the world is flat." Such dualism is not unknown in other than Mohammedan lands.

Now to the modern minister such a position is absolutely impossible, and for the reason that no more would he expect religion to be an authority on the shape of the earth than he would expect to find a formula of calculus in the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, in that little episode we have in a sentence one of the main reasons for so much of the fruitless and profitless struggle between religious and scientific thinkers; namely, an erroneous view of Scripture, due, no doubt, to too narrow a view of God. Just so long as we believe that God has spoken only in one period of the world's history—the past—that he has spoken only through one agency—the ancient Hebrews—that he has left only one record of his revelation—the Bible—just so long must we believe that the Bible contains all of the truth of God, and consequently must be inerrant in all that it touches. But when one realizes that God is a living God, that he is forever seeking to express and reveal himself, and that he is limited by the human agency through which his revelations are made, then he regards the Bible not as being the sun but the sunlight—rays from the great Sun of truth—then he can say with the poet Lowell:

> Slowly the Bible of the race is writ,
> And not on paper leaves nor leaves of stone;
> Each age, each kindred adds to it
> Texts of despair or hope, of joy or moan.
> While swings the sea, while mists the mountains shroud,
> While thunder's surges burst on cliffs of cloud,
> Still at the prophets' feet the nations sit.

Might not one's position be expressed in this way, that while he believes that the revelation of God is consummated in the life of Jesus, it is not closed? God still has many things to say to us just as soon as we can hear them. As some one has aptly expressed it, "In Christianity there is something before us to be discovered, not merely something behind us to be learned."

Now when one thus views the Scriptures, such a thing as a conflict between science and the Bible, or between science and religion, is a contradiction of terms. There could be no conflict for the simple reason that they have no common ground on which to stage the battle. No more could there be a conflict between science and religion than could there be a conflict between a steam-engine and the ideal of democracy. As Professor Thomson reminds us, the aim of science is "description," while that of religion is "interpretation." "In short," he writes, "science and religion are incommensurables." His position is perhaps reenforced by that illuminating and reassuring article of Professor Millikan, who reminds us that from the point of view of the great men of science, from Newton on, and the great religious thinkers, from Augustine, there has never been any real conflict between science and religion.

When one reads, for example, in Genesis that God made the earth and man in six days; and when, on the other hand, anthropologists and geologists, after years of faithful and painstaking study, with irrefutable evidences assure him that the process of creation of man was nearer 60,000 years, what does he do? Does he on the one hand dismiss the conclusions of science with clever witticisms which appeal to the popular ear but betray great poverty of thought, or on the other hand, accept the conclusions of science at the cost of his faith in the Bible as being the inspired word of God? Absolutely not. He is forced into no such dilemma as that; and for the simple reason that he would no more expect accurate scientific knowledge from the writer of Genesis than he would expect the writer of the Twenty-third Psalm to be an authority on wireless telegraphy. Some fifty years ago Henry Drummond, a scientist and one of the most Christlike men who ever lived, a man whose spirit so reflected that of his Master that after his death many people who had known him confessed that they found themselves praying to him, wrote:

The contest is dying out. The new view of the Bible has rendered apologetics almost superfluous. No one now expects science from the Bible. The literary form of Genesis precludes the idea that it is science. You might as well contrast "Paradise Lost" with geology, as the book of Genesis.

Did not the writer of Genesis make his age-long contribution when he wrote, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"? I do not believe that there is any true scientist who would flatly deny that statement. On the contrary, one of them wrote recently, "It is certain that every step of science discloses the attributes of the Almighty with growing magnificence."

And what is true of the relationship between the Bible and science is true also in history. We are told by many scholars that certain minor portions of the Old Testament cannot be regarded as literally true history. An admittedly conservative scholar, Professor Sayce, has said, "Assyrian inscriptions have shown that the chronology of the book of Kings is hopelessly wrong." What, then, does the minister do? Does he fly in the face of modern research and scholarship, or accepting it, does he feel that he cannot take the Bible as a reliable guide for life? Far from it. For here again he feels that the Bible was not written merely to give us a record of historic events, although this it undoubtedly does in the majority of instances; but to do something far more important than that—to give us a spiritual interpretation of history. May we not agree with Marcus Dods, that great Scottish scholar, when in his book, "The Bible, Its Origin and Nature," he writes:

If a man desires to acquaint himself with the history of the ancient world, there are other books to which you would more naturally refer him; but if he seeks enlightenment regarding the preparation made by history for the coming of Christ, you would refer him to the Bible. If he seeks information regarding the formation of this globe and the introduction of life upon it, there are works in palæontology which will satisfy

him, but if he desires to be impressed with the relation of God to the world and its life, you will refer him to Genesis. If he craves a knowledge of the time of Christ, there are other books he may profitably consult; but if he wishes to know Christ, and through this ultimate revelation to see the Father, you do not hesitate to say, "In the Gospels you will find what you seek." It is idle to assert that if we cannot say of each clause of the Bible, "This is infallibly true," we cannot refer to the Bible as the Word of God at all.

It might be well for us to recall those graphic words of Bishop Ulrich of Augsburg when he said, "Press not the breasts of Holy Writ too hard, lest they yield blood rather than milk."

To the minister of today, therefore, the talk of a conflict between the truth of God as revealed in Scripture and the truth of God as revealed in science, or history, or in any other field, is more apparent than real. The conflict may exist in our minds, but in reality it does not, for God is the sole source of *all* truth.

Let me now suggest some of the results which obtain from this emphasis on the God-given origin of all truth. For one thing, it makes the minister very sympathetic with the findings of modern scholarship. By this I do not mean that, like the Athenians, he is ever anxious to tell and to hear some new thing, but I do mean that to the results of sober and mature research and scholarship he simply cannot close his eyes. He feels with Phillips Brooks that "the pen of the scholar has done as much for Christianity as the blood of the martyr." That the church, historically speaking, has been at times positively antagonistic to the discovery of truth which seemed to contradict any of its established tenets is only too well known. When, for example, Copernicus in the sixteenth century advanced his new theory about the universe, stating that the universe was solar-centric rather than geocentric, a position which leads to quite a different cosmology than that given in the early chapters of the Bible, many of the ardent churchmen attacked him. Martin Luther was only expressing the opinion of the

great religious thinkers of the age, when he called Copernicus "an upstart astrologer," and further said,

> The fool wishes to revolutionize the whole science of astronomy, but, as the Holy Scriptures show, Joshua commanded the *sun* to stand still, not the earth.

Another, Calovius by name, said, "Who would dare to set the authority of Copernicus above the authority of God?" But now we know Copernicus was in reality revealing to the world the authority of God, rather than attacking it. The minister of today views differently the Copernicus of his own age. He listens sympathetically to the voice of archæology which has revivified the ancient world, and which, through inscriptions, monuments, excavations, and libraries has told us many new things about the Old Testament, and its relation to other and older sacred writings. By the study of comparative religion he more easily understands certain portions of the Gospel records. Through the study of anthropology he sees more clearly how different beliefs developed and were adhered to during different stages of civilization. The voice which is speaking today is that of modern psychology, but here again his position is one of sympathetic toleration, he waits in faith and not in fear.

Now I am not saying that the modern minister must accept as final authority all the voices that speak to him from these varied fields of modern investigation. It would not be scientific to do that. But he approaches the whole problem with an open, sympathetic mind. His attitude toward "Higher Criticism" or "Modernism"—rather vague and perhaps unfortunate terms—is not one either of rebellion or grudging and reluctant submission as to an "unfortunate epidemic"; but rather he welcomes these things as he would "welcome convalescence." He does not feel that necessarily the results of modern scientific scholarship will be the casting of ugly shadows upon the clear sunlight of his faith, he rather feels that

if these results are true, they may make more brilliant and life-giving the faith he already possesses.

Another result of this faith in the God-given origin of all truth is seen in our missionary enterprise. A modern missionary asked recently, "Do you really believe that God could have spoken volumes to Moses, and not even whispered to old Confucius?" The modern missionary believes that God has whispered to old Confucius. He believes with Paul that the same God who has revealed himself to us in Christ Jesus is the same God whom, like the Athenians of old, others ignorantly worship, and consequently the missionary goes to foreign lands in the spirit of Jesus, not to "destroy but to fulfil." Not only does a belief in the God-given origin of all truth force one to this view of other faiths, but a consciousness of the imperfections of his own religion as practised by us Westerners also forces him to a position of sympathetic understanding. Listen to some of the recent comments of foreign students in America. One who has been here nine months remarked:

> Christianity no doubt is good, but it is not easy to find a Christian. Of what use is it to boast of one's religion, if its ideals are not embodied in the lives of the majority of its followers?

A Chinese student summed up our land as follows, "A Christian country full of pagans, out-and-out heathen." A Hindu, three years resident in America said that "Here and there is an occasional flicker of the true Christian spirit, but America's young people are mostly unchristian."

In the light of all this, the modern missionary has developed a new point of view. Listen to Prof. Daniel J. Flemming, a well-known authority on our missionary policy, when he writes:

> If I were trying to picture the most significant struggle that is on, I would not primarily think of Christ on the one side with Buddha, Zoroaster, and Confucius on the other, but as arrayed against the Christ I would put—cutting right across all people—competitive nationalism and

the war spirit, the greed and exploitation of self-centered peoples, unbrotherliness, and irreligion. Here is the struggle of our day, and in this struggle Christianity finds itself the ally and fulfiller of the other faiths rather than their enemy.

Or listen to the late Dr. Howard S. Bliss, that missionary statesman, for many years president of the Beirut Protestant College in Syria. In his last public article as printed in *The Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1920, and entitled "The Modern Missionary," he writes:

> He does not believe that Christianity is the sole channel through which divine and saving truth has been conveyed, and this persuasion he admits ungrudgingly and gratefully. For it at once enlarges his spiritual fellowship. Thus seeking and thus working, he discovers with a new humility that, with very much to give, he has not a little to receive from men of other faiths. He is not content to combat the error which looms so large in the creeds of other men. He is anxious to find the kernel of truth of which so often that error is but a distorted expression. He comes to supplement, not solely to create.

This, then, is one of the aspects of a young minister's faith which I think is of great importance: Faith in a God who is big enough to be the source of all truth everywhere, in science, in history, in other religions, everywhere. God is no longer simply the player upon one instrument. He is the Conductor of the whole orchestra which, although it may have many voices of different pitch and quality of tone, has essential harmony. He believes that this is God's world—all of it—and he seeks to make God articulate with the whole of it.

## II

Another thing which characterizes the faith of the young minister is the fact that he is centering his thoughts and his energies in and about religion, rather than about theology. In using the term "religion" I am thinking now of the Christian religion. He is doing this because he believes that religion will

save the world, and that if theology were able to save the world, it would have been saved long ago.

Now religion and theology are very closely related subjects, and to some it may seem splitting hairs to try to separate them. But as a matter of fact, there is between them a very great difference which we should ever keep clearly in mind.

What is religion? The late Dr. William Newton Clarke, of Colgate, simply and rightly defines it as "the life of God, lived in the soul of man." I do not care whose definition we accept or how we define it, I am sure of only this, that religion always and ever deals with life. It is a way of life.

Now what is theology? Prof. William Adams Brown defines Christian theology as being

> that branch of theological science which aims to give systematic expression to the doctrines of the Christian faith. . . Theology is the science which treats of these convictions. It is its function to point out their basis in experience; to explain their historic forms; to show their inner harmony and consistency, and so to relate them to present thought and life.

One feels that he is traveling here in an entirely different world, and so he is, for while the function of religion is to deal with life, to give a way of life, that of theology is to give an intellectual interpretation or explanation of that way; these are very different things.

Religion says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Theology asks, "Who is my neighbor?" and frequently goes so far afield in a theoretical discussion as to what constitutes neighborliness, that the religious act is never performed. Now the young minister is vastly more concerned with the religious act than he is with theoretical discussions about it.

Do not think for a minute that theology does not fulfil an important function. It does. It is a most natural and necessary thing for one to give intellectual content to the faith that is in him. Furthermore, what a man believes affects in a very real sense the way he lives. One would indeed be guilty of very shallow and superficial thinking were he to try to brush

aside in one swoop all the theological accumulations of the centuries. Rightly does Doctor Jefferson refer to theology as being the "queen of the sciences." No one who appreciates even a little the type of men who formulated our theology or the reason or conditions that led to its formation could speak lightly of it. It is not against theology as such, therefore, that one speaks, but rather against the attempt to have theology take to itself the function which belongs only to religion.

How very easy it is for us, for example, to measure a man's faith exclusively in terms of his theological beliefs. How many of us think that the men of great faith are the men who, looking back, can take up the dogmas or creeds of their forefathers and say, *"I believe this."* We have identified faith with theology. The young ministers, if I may speak for them, do not do that. They are more likely to identify faith with religion. Jude in his brief epistle speaks of "the faith that was once delivered to the saints," but one wonders sometimes if faith is something which can be thus delivered. When faith becomes unalterably "The faith" and can be thus delivered from one generation to another, even as one might deliver Newton's unalterable law of gravitation, it ceases to be faith, and becomes fact; for faith, by its very nature must contain an element of uncertainty. It is "the evidence of things not seen." And as the Apostle further reminds us, "Hope that is seen is *not* hope: for what a man seeth, why does he yet hope for it?" Doctor Hutton, of Glasgow, is right when he says, "Certainty is the end of faith."

When Martin Luther was engaged in his life-and-death struggle with the Catholic Church, he published a work called "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," which was written primarily for the theologians of his age, and was a most radical attack upon the traditional sacramental system of the church. Even King Henry the Eighth of England thought it worth while to write an answer to it, and for this he was rewarded by the pope with the title of *Defender of the Faith.*

But in the light of history we can clearly see that while Henry the Eighth might have been defending *the* faith, the Protestant Reformer was doing something far more important. He was defending *faith,* and *faith* is always more important than *the* faith. Now faith is religion. *The* faith is theology. One is life, it is the spirit of God within us urging us on into All Truth. It is the spirit of the pioneer. It is Abram seeking a new country, although not knowing whither he goes. The other is the spirit of Terah who died in Haran.

We speak about the " faith of our fathers," but do we ever stop to think of just what the faith was? Read again the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. What was the faith of these fathers, of Abraham who journeyed, " not knowing whither he went," of Noah who was warned " of things not seen as yet," of Moses who endured " as seeing Him who is invisible "? Was the faith of these fathers belief in the theological statements of the past? No! In every instance their faith was forward-looking. It was the courage to attempt big things for God under the guidance of his eternal Spirit.

What was the faith of our Master? Was it merely conformity to the established beliefs of his age? How often did he say to his disciples, " Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time " . . . " But I say unto you," or again, " Verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you "; and once he told a Roman centurion that he had found more faith in him than He had found in Israel, that is, in those who trusted simply in their Judaism. Yes, faith to the Master was founded in life. It was not a looking back only, it was primarily " looking forward." It was not simply believing something from the past, but rather attempting something in the future.

But there is another reason why the young minister places the emphasis on religion rather than on theology, and that is

because theology is so often divorced from the real interests and problems of modern life. Luther once referred to theology as being "that which explores the kernel of the nut, the heart of the wheat, and the marrow of the bone." But one seeks in vain to find any such life in our modern theological conflicts, more nearly do they correspond to a story that I read recently about Henry Ward Beecher who, with his dog went out walking one afternoon. His dog saw a woodchuck dart through a hole in the fence, and ever after that whenever the dog passed that fence he would stand by that hole and bark his head off.

One of our modern ministers is quite right when he says:

> Half the questions of theology and more, that have vexed human hearts and have lain at the basis of heresy trials, do not matter. They may have a place upon the side streets of Christian thinking, but they ought to be kept from littering the avenues. The reason why nine-tenths of our theological controversies are an idle beating of the air, is that whichever side wins, it makes no difference to character.

The young minister is determined as far as in him lies to keep theological discussions on the side streets. Jesus once said, "I am the door," and a minister should be careful lest he put so much theological debris in front of that Door as to make it difficult, if not impossible, for others to gain access to the presence of the Eternal. Now to do this one must draw ever and always a clear line between the God-inspired *religion of Jesus,* which is the gospel of Christ, and the man-made religion about Jesus, which frequently has nothing to do with the gospel of Christ.

It is an undeniable fact that we have worked out such an elaborate religion about Jesus that we have all but obscured the religion of Jesus, and that in the place of his God-inspired teachings to us, we have put our man-created teachings about him. Verily, a poor substitute! The religion of Jesus as contained in the Gospels is the most direct, searching, forceful, and inescapable power on earth, but the religion about

Jesus as contained in creeds and dogmas and apologetics, is very abstruse, to the lay mind often unintelligible, and frequently is foreign to every real vital problem of life. The religion of Jesus will save the world. It is the only thing that will. The religion about Jesus frequently has no life-saving power in it. In putting the emphasis upon the religion of Jesus, rather than the theological discussions about him, one is really doing what the Master himself would do, for it is said upon good authority that a single page would hold all that he ever said upon theological subjects.

The young minister therefore refuses to have a faith which can only be kept alive by endless "argumentative coddling" or being cooped up behind theological fortresses. He feels that if his faith is any good it ought to defend him, rather than that he should be forever seeking to defend it. He believes with Doctor Jacks of Oxford that the weakest religions, and the weakest phases in history of every religion, are those which spend most energy in defending themselves, rather than in attacking the real enemies of life, or he could say with Professor Rufus Jones, "Every sacred book might be burned, and every temple razed to the ground, but religion could not be destroyed without destroying man himself."

If, therefore, one places his faith in religion, rather than in theology, it is because of his faith in life. Theological systems have changed in the past, theological systems will change in the future. But he regards these as being but the thought forms by which men have sought to give expression to eternal truth, the scaffoldings by which men have ever sought to construct the abiding and enduring temple of God, which is indeed an house not made with hands, but is eternal in the heavens.

## III

The ministers of today are recognizing in a new way the significance of the Cross, for here one meets the sum total of all

reality. It is the Cross that is the crowning glory of the Christian religion. It is the Cross that removes all sham and insincerity from the Christian religion, and wins for the Master the respect and the loyalty of those who have found him. Perhaps it was the fact that the Master faced it, and conquered it, that brought from Charles Lamb his tribute when he said, "If Shakespeare should come into this room we should uncover, but if Jesus should come into this room we should kneel."

Now when I speak of faith in the Cross, I do not mean that the minister of today is keenly interested in the various theories of the atonement advanced by so many different writers. Frankly, he is not so much, and for the reason that he believes that one reason why the Cross has not done more to save the world is because we have been thinking of salvation far too much in terms of theories. We have been thinking of salvation as being a static, accomplished fact, shut up in a book, rather than as being an eternally creative process. In other words, we have been thinking of it far too much in theological and far too little in sociological terms. But in simplest language, by faith in the Cross I mean that the minister today feels that it is full time for us to begin to take Jesus seriously. For is not that what the Cross means? The Pharisees had no cross; yes, and their religion had no power. It consisted in making broad the phylacteries, and enlarging the borders of their garments, and a long list of mechanical performances which were very harmless, and very useless. But not so with the religion of Jesus. His religion dealt with the most real and vital things. Jesus, to use an expression of Emerson, "spake things," not words. One can no more escape his teachings than he can escape life, and what he said he meant. He was deadly in earnest. And his Cross is the silent and everlasting testimony to the faithfulness and sincerity of his whole life. As some one has said, "the gospel of Jesus is bound in a Man."

When we come right down to it, we have precious little to show for nineteen hundred years of Christian preaching and teaching. Professor Ellwood in "The Reconstruction of Religion," does not exaggerate our condition when he speaks of our "semi-pagan civilization." Our civilization is not Christian, and I am convinced that one reason for this is that we have not been taking Jesus seriously. We have forgotten the Cross. Loudly have we called him, "Lord, Lord," but we have not done the things that he has commanded. We preach peace, but at the first provocation we fly at each other's throats, and make of the Universal Father of Mankind a nationalistic deity bedecked in the robes of a shallow patriotism. We read his words about loving our enemies and blessing those who persecute, and forgiving those who have wronged us, but we do exactly the opposite, and are at present engaged in sowing the large harvest-fields of hate and revenge which the generations to come will reap in tears and blood. We do not take Jesus seriously, and my claim is that it is about time we did. We must remember the Cross. The Cross proves once and for all that the way of service, and sacrifice and love is the way of life.

This may seem a most natural thing for ministers to say. But thank God, ministers are not saying it today any more than are other people. Those who have the best insight into our social and moral problems are saying it. Economists are saying it. Henry C. Emery, formerly Professor of Economics in Yale University, has said:

> We are told by some writers that the world is waiting in an agony of expectation for some great social philosopher who shall bring to it the new message of salvation. If so, the world is wrong, for there is no message to bring it peace from its manifold ills, save that heard nineteen centuries ago from the profoundest of social philosophers, the *Man of Nazareth.*

Secular papers are saying it. *The Nation* in December, 1918, wrote:

BERKELEY BAPTIST
DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

One might as well forget the laws of gravitation in the physical world, as to ignore in the social world the ethical principles which Jesus enunciated. Humanity would be about as safe in one case as in the other.

Sociologists are saying it. Professor Ellwood, one of the leading sociologists in our country, recently wrote:

It is time that organized Christianity become synonymous with the religion of Jesus. The vision which Jesus had of a social life based upon love or good-will is not an unrealizable dream. It is the only possible social future if the world is not going to turn back to barbarism.

The world is very sick, and we have *the only medicine that will cure it*. It is time that we took the message of our Master seriously, and like him "speak things."

We have bread, let us not give out stones. We have power, let us not deal in platitudes. We have a Cross, which gives meaning, reality, and content to every word that fell from the Master's lips.

Listen to a modern rationalist outside the church. It is really a prayer, for the very reality of which we are speaking. Listen to him as he prays:

Jesus Christ, come back! The tones of your voice have not yet died away. In spite of false creeds, and wizard priests, through craft and want, the heart of our age still turns to you. Touch the sorcery of our time and wake us from the vile enchantment of fear and foolish hate. Come! Deliver us from the doom of dead things. Bring life from the grave where faith lies bound. Jesus Christ, come back! Bring dreams, and let dreams come true! Bring love that knits all hearts into one.

In truth, He is the Light of the World!

# ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

## THE LENGTH OF THE LIVES OF THE PATRIARCHS

EDWARD CHIERA
The University of Pennsylvania

A TELEGRAM from London, under the date of December 29, 1923, announces the discovery at Oxford of a new four-sided prism, inscribed in the Sumerian language, which gives a list of all the kings who ruled in Babylonia from the Creation to the end of the Isin Dynasty. Such a prism belongs to the H. Weld-Blundell's collection and has been studied by Professor Langdon and Doctor Fotheringham.

The new document gives us first of all the names of the eight kings who ruled during the 241,200 years preceding the Flood. The Flood itself is represented as lasting 4,800 years, though this figure may need verification. The postdiluvian period down to the end of the Isin Dynasty (i. e., to about 2,100 B. C.) occupies 32,553 years, which are covered by twenty dynasties, ruling in eleven cities.

The first kingdom after the Flood was established at Kish, a site which is now being excavated by the British Museum, and is described as lasting 24,510 years, three months, and three and a half days. This kingdom had twenty-three kings. Then followed the kingdom of Erech—twelve kings and 2,319 years—and the second kingdom of Kish. This last brings us to the beginning of the historical period, with the first kingdom of the city of Ur, the country of Abraham. From this point onward the prism gives us an unbroken list of the kings and the length of their reigns; from the four kings of Ur, who reigned 177 years, to the reign of Hammurapi, the conqueror of the last king of the Isin Dynasty.

Disregarding newspaper exaggeration, which would make

this one of the greatest archæological discoveries of all times, there is no doubt that such a prism, if complete and in good condition, will add much to our present knowledge, and will help us toward filling many gaps in the history of ancient Babylonia.

But the newspaper accounts omitted to say that the contents of the prism had already been anticipated, in part at least, by discoveries in the Nippur Collection of the University of Pennsylvania. In 1914 A. Poebel had published, in his "Historical Texts," several tablets which gave the names and length of reign of many of more or less legendary personages from the period preceding and following the Flood. The lists continued, as the Oxford prism does, well into the historical period. The chief contribution of the new discovery will then be in filling the many gaps in the material we already had, and giving us a list unbroken from the beginning to the end.

One thing in the newly discovered lists of Babylonian "patriarchs" must strike the attention of the Biblical student. The period of 241,200 years preceding the Flood is represented only by eight kings who lived and ruled for periods of time so long, that the 969 years of the life of Methuselah pale into insignificance. The Greek writer Berosus, who has preserved for us another Babylonian list of ten prediluvian kings ending with Noah, gives for their cumulative reign 432,000 years, which range from a maximum of 64,800 to a minimum of 10,800 for each king. Noah was one of the three who had reigned 64,800 years.

When confronted by figures such as these, one naturally asks himself: Did the Babylonians really believe that their ancient heroes had lived for such incredibly long periods of time? They certainly did not. They knew, however, that the world was much older than the date corresponding to 4,000 B. C. We might say that they had historical records going back further than that date, and they accordingly pushed the date of the creation of the earth as far back as they could.

However, they had not sufficient historical and traditional records to fill up a gap in their history which would extend into hundreds of thousands of years. If they wanted to avoid confessing their ignorance by leaving a blank in their past history, they had only two alternatives: either to invent new names for their supposed patriarchs, or to stretch the length of the lives of the personages they knew, so as to make them cover the whole period. They resorted to the last alternative, as the one which did the least violence to facts. Hence the exceptional longevity of the Babylonian heroes.

The Hebrews were confronted by the same problem. However, they were comparatively late arrivals upon the scene. The history of their patriarchs begins with Abraham, who lived about the same time of Hammurapi, i. e., when Babylonian history is already well past the legendary stage. Moreover, the Hebrews did not live among the ruins of the past, which would remind them of the great age of human civilization. For their scanty traditions, a date of about 4,000 B. C. for the creation of man was more than sufficient. It was therefore not necessary for them to multiply the average length of human life by a thousand, to make their heroes live a sufficient length of time. A multiplication by ten was more than sufficient, as witness the 969 years of Methuselah.

And I cannot help thinking that, in doing so, the Hebrews have probably followed the example of the Babylonians, whose traditions they certainly must have known. Otherwise, we might have had a date for the creation of man much nearer to us than 4,000 B. C.

## *ὑπωπιάζειν*, A WORD STUDY

There is a persistent tendency among translators to soften the strong words and expressions, to resolve figures of speech, and hence to reduce much of the virility and picturesqueness of the original to prosy flatness. Many instances of this may be found in the Septuagint. (E. g., "Enoch walked with God," becomes "Enoch pleased, *εὐηρέστησεν*, God," Gen. 5 : 24; and the expression "was not" becomes "was not found," cf. Heb. 11 : 5, where the writer follows LXX.)

The apostle Paul is very fond of striking figures of speech, of picturesque words, as Dean Howson, a half century ago, delightfully pointed out in his brochure, "The Metaphors of St. Paul," indicating the many expressions drawn by the apostle, from Roman soldiery, classical architecture, ancient agriculture, and the Greek games. Among illustrations from the latter are several references to the art of boxing. In 1 Corinthians 9 : 27, Paul says, *ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα*, "I strike under the eye my body," or "I give my body a black eye." A. V., "I keep under my body" is a weak rendition, or a translation of a different word. R. V. Cant. and Amer. Standard, "I buffet," margin "bruise," which is better. So also American Bible Union version, Weston, Hovey, and Broadus. If one holds back from the retention of so bold a figure as that of blacking the eye, doubtless "bruise" is as accurate and elegant an expression as can be found to reproduce in English the apostle's meaning. The Vulgate renders the word by the less definite word *castigo*, "chastise," "restrain," "punish." Beza's *contundo*, "bruise," is nearer to the apostle's expressive word. Doubtless the Vulgate rendition, "chastise," may appear as both cause and effect in the Roman Catholic monastic development. (Cf. Kent's Shorter Bible, "I discipline my body.") Irenæus was more literal, *corpus meum lividum facio*.

It is unfortunate for the strength of Paul's utterance that some Greek manuscripts should have been changed so that ὑπωπιάζω becomes ὑποπιάζω, to "keep down" or "hold in subjection." It is rather strange that Tischendorf should give place to this reading when the best manuscripts are overwhelmingly against it, namely, ℵ, *A*, *B*, and the majority of uncials and minuscules. It is quite easy to see how a copyist with a whole sentence in his mind as he writes, should insert ὑποπιάζω, "to bring into subjection," for ὑπωπιάζω, since the next verb of the sentence conveys that identical idea, δουλαγωγῶ, "lead" or "keep in slavery." It is hardly so probable that the dignified ὑποπιάζω, "subdue," should be rejected for the more extraordinary ὑπωπιάζω, "hit under the eye."

Tyndale uses the weaker expression, "I tame my body," and Luther, *betäube*, "stun"; Weizsäcker, more picturesquely and accurately, *Ich zerschlage meinen Leib*, "beat," or "wear out with beating, my body." Meyer prefers, *Ich blaue mir den Leib*, "I make (black and) blue my body." The French versions, however, follow generally the Vulgate in softening the figure: *Je mortifie mon corps*. Probably none has made a better effort to reproduce the intensity of Paul's utterance than has Moffatt (followed by Ballantine), "I maul and master my body." Weymouth, "I hit hard and straight at my body."

The word ὑπωπιάζω occurs in but one other place in the New Testament—in Luke 18 : 5. Here the word has given translators more trouble; perhaps because they have lacked humor, just as, in some other cases, they have erred for want of imagination. The unjust judge resolves to accede to the demands of the importunate widow, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος ἐρχομένη ὑπωπιάζῃ με, "Lest at last she come and (literally) give me a black eye," or "beat me black and blue." Shall we say the judge was speaking with mock fear, or are we to reduce the word to a less emphatic and less picturesque rendering? This has been done by a number of translators. The King James version is familiar: "Lest by her continual coming she *weary* me."

The Revised Versions, English and American, read, "wear me out," margin "bruise." Goodspeed has followed this reading, "So she may not finally wear me out with her coming." Moffatt has it "forever coming and pestering me." Both Weymouth and Robertson use "pester." The valuable version of George Campbell, James McKnight, and Phillip Doddridge, which should be better known, though long out of print, undertakes to preserve the figure and yet to give the idea of insistence, and so happily chooses the word *plague,* which originally meant "to strike." So, freely, the New Century New Testament, "plaguing me with her endless visits."

There is no certain case, however, unless this passage be one, either in the New Testament or out of it, where ὑπωπιάζω means "weary" or "pester," "wear out," or the like. The Septuagint uses once the noun form ὑπώπιον (Prov. 20 : 30), where in the plural it translates חַבּוּרֹת פֶּצַע, "wounding blows." It is therefore more natural to suppose that the judge intended to be facetious in using the energetic word ὑπωπιάζειν, saying, "Lest she come at last and hitting me under the eye, knock me out"—not *literally* or physically "make an assault," but "pummel me with words; give me a verbal beating." It may be rightly said that if the judge expected a knock-out blow from the woman, the aorist, which denotes single action, rather than the present tense would be used. But what the judge really feared was not a single stroke, on the final visit, but a pelting of verbal blows in his face. Shakespeare was much influenced in his style by a knowledge of the Bible, though it was said of him he had "little Latin and small Greek." Yet he made Philip in "King John" cry out from experience much in the spirit of the unjust judge by anticipation, "A word of his but buffets better than a fist of France: Zounds! I was never so *bethumped with words.*"

Edward B. Pollard.

# NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

Revival of interest in religion on the part of two groups that formerly had little to say on this important theme has become conspicuous of late. We refer to those who manage our great daily newspapers, and those who conduct our big business enterprises. The former have discovered that religion is good copy, and the latter, that it is really good business. How much of the discovery on the part of the newspapers is due to the controversial character of recent religious activity, we may not accurately decide. But a good fight makes good copy, whether the fight be in a cock-pit, or a pulpit. The shame of it! Constructive teaching is good, and that must go on. Conviction cannot be chloroformed by any agreement or compromise, nor by the silent suppression of facts. In a free and open market men will buy the truth—eventually; and in accord with the words of the wise, *will not sell it.* In this period of doctrinal ferment, the confessional communions are crying, "Back to the creeds!" The late Lambeth proposals would place the so-called Apostles' Creed and that of Nicæa as the sufficient norm of belief for all Christendom. Harris, an English writer, would have these set up as the standard in the exact and identical meaning of their framers. The American bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church have issued a pronouncement calling the priests to teach the standards according to their evident meaning. The last Assembly of the Presbyterian Church held up anew the historic teachings of that body as contained in the Westminster Confession. In the non-creedal churches, such as the Baptist denomination, those whose annual associations are missionary bodies, organized for the practical extension of Christ's kingdom through cooperative effort of the independent churches that compose them, the introduction of creedal discussion be-

comes a much more complicated and delicate problem. For here there are involved, not only the questions whether a creed should be adopted, and if adopted, what should be its contents and form of words, but also what may properly be the organ of promulgation in matters of doctrine—the local church, the local Association, or the national Convention? It is a significant fact, at any rate, that those churches that have set up creedal standards are not more united in the present crisis than those which have historically and on principle refused to adopt formal confessions. Indeed, it would seem that humanly formulated creeds have come to be more a source of division than of union.

One of T. R. Glover's more recent volumes is that named for the first, but least important of all the essays contained in it, "The Pilgrim." The essay upon "The Religion of Martin Luther" is one of the most readable and suggestive. A selection from it may be helpful to that large number of Christians who are prone to begin with some theory, or some dogma, and work toward the facts, rather than the reverse:

> Everything turns on the incarnation, but the incarnation does not begin with a doctrine and an abstract noun—it begins with a baby. "Begin thou where Christ began," says Luther, inculcating what we have to learn, viz., that fact precedes theory, even if it is dogma, and that history comes before theology—the history of Christ, the history of the church, and the history of you and me. Thus said Luther: "Without Christ we cannot know God. The Father himself is too high; therefore he saith, 'I will show you a way whereby you may come unto me, namely, Christ; believe in him, depend on him, and then in due time ye shall well find who I am.'"

The strongest arguments for the divinity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, and kindred doctrines, do not begin with theorizing about Jesus, but are found in Jesus himself.

The Fourth R is the name of one of the recent books dealing with moral and religious education. It is by Homer

S. Bodley and published by Revell. The fourth "R" is, as one might perhaps guess, Righteousness. The manifest inadequacy of reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic to make manhood and womanhood is now clearly discerned by all. Where rests the responsibility for giving "*instruction* in righteousness," as Paul puts the matter, is a question of serious moment. The family seems to have passed the duty over to the Church, and the Church is in danger of the mistake of passing it along to the State. Week-day religious instruction is bound to grow, but if the family and the church do not awake to their sense of responsibility for the religious education of the children, in vain will the public-school system be able to save us from moral bankruptcy. We need to put four L's into our ideals of education: Light, Liberty, Love, Life, as well as the three R's.

In the witticism of G. K. Chesterton that "Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; but found difficult and not tried," we have both a truth and a falsity, as in most sententious sayings. Christianity has been tried, and it has not been tried. It has succeeded, and it has failed. In no respect has its failure been more marked than in the fact that *fellowship* comes so slowly. In a stimulating little volume of essays by Dean William R. Inge and others, called "Religion and Life," there is a chapter by Father W. H. Frere on "Christianity as Fellowship," in which Paul's conception of "in Christ" gives the key. The apostle declares that Jesus Christ broke down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, so making peace. But how quickly were barriers again set up. Christians themselves soon began to split up into parties, each group disfellowshiping the others. Exclusion became a note of orthodoxy. Christianity was no longer looked upon as a mode of fellowship; "in Christ," no longer the measure of brotherhood, but outward customs and human shibboleths were set up as tests of fraternalism. It is a wholesome sign when even

a High-churchman discerns that Christianity is not at its best in bulls, excommunications, and anathemas, but when it reveals fellowship in Christ Jesus.

For some months the fame of Blaise Pascal has been reburnished; for the world was reminded that three hundred years ago, this remarkable genius was born. Like a brilliant meteor, he flashed across the literary sky, beginning at twelve years to startle his contemporaries with the mathematical insight of a Euclid, and passing away at thirty-nine, leaving behind him some of the profoundest comments upon religion and life that were ever penned. His *Pensées*—" Thoughts," chiefly philosophical reflections upon man's moral and religious life, make a collection of pregnant comments upon nature and mankind second to no other of its sort. Besides, Pascal is credited with having achieved for the French language what Luther did for the German, and the King James translators of the Bible for the English, namely, with having set a new standard for French literary style.

At the age of twenty-six, when it seemed he was about to become, if indeed, he had not already been ranked as the leading mathematician and scientist of his day, Pascal abandoned science for philosophy. His nature was essentially religious. Withdrawing to the privacy of his own meditations, and the company of congenial friends, he gave himself entirely to thoughts upon the deeper meaning of life. His keen wit was used freely, but to expose folly and error, rather than to wound. His remark concerning Cleopatra's nose—" Had it been shorter, the face of the world had been changed "—though perhaps more frequently quoted than any other, is among the least weighty of his " thoughts." To Jesus Christ he freely gave the supreme place in moral grandeur:

> The distance between Matter and Mind typifies the infinitely greater distance between Mind and Love. Great geniuses have their empire, their splendor, their victory, their renown. These are seen with the

eyes of the mind, and that is sufficient. Holy men again have their empire and their renown—that of love, goodness, and sainthood. Jesus Christ, without external splendor, without the outward repute of science, is supreme in his own order, the realm of holiness.

PASCAL, though indulging much in philosophizing, saw as clearly as some of the foremost thinkers of our own day, such as Henri Bergson and Bertrand Russell, have seen, the limitations of human reason for penetrating to the heart of the universe or of man. Said he:

> We know the truth not only by reasoning, but by feeling and by a vivid and luminous power of direct comprehension, and it is by this last faculty that we discern first principles. And it is vain for reasoning, which has no share in discovering these principles, to attempt the subverting of them.

And again, he declared with his usual discernment:

> If we submit everything to reason, our religion will have nothing in it mysterious or supernatural. If we violate the principles of reason, our religion will be absurd and ridiculous. There is nothing so in conformity with reason as the disavowal of the supremacy of reason.

We could wish this brilliant seer had discerned more in Jesus than the superlative character and the supreme example; but Pascal is worthy of rereading today, because of his moral discernment and his testimony to the limitation of reason in the realm where intuition and faith must show the way. It will always be true that "the heart hath reasons, which the reason cannot know," as Pascal himself affirms.

THE death of John Henry Jowett leaves the ranks of the preachers of England and of the world sadly impoverished. It has come to the lot of few preachers, during their lifetime, to become more "the preacher's preacher" than he. Frederick W. Robertson was discovered by other preachers only after he had done his work, and his sermons had been sent out in printed

form. Hundreds of ministers read with fructified minds the printed sermons of Jowett, and scores, at almost every service, heard his living voice in the afternoon services of the church at which he ministered while in America. Many preachers came long distances to hear him while preaching in New York, Birmingham, and London.

Jowett's insight into Scripture, his spiritual interpretation of life, his direct naturalness, his personal identification of himself with his message, the simplicity and charm of his style, raised him to the very highest level of modern preachers. He had preeminently the "wooing note." His sermons suggested the Mount of Transfiguration and of Calvary rather than of Sinai. Men marveled that he could live and minister for some years in the great American metropolis, in the midst of the surgings of social and political events, and show no direct signs of interest in them, when he stood in his pulpit. But the great preacher knew his calling, and he made that sure. Like Paul, he said, "This one thing I do." His message was preeminently to the individual soul. He recognized this to be central. There was, however, in his preaching the social implicit. His very first sermon preached, on taking charge of his New York pastorate, was from the text, "When he saw the multitude, he was moved with compassion." The preacher's opening sentences were these:

> Perhaps the words of the Master will stand out in clear relief if I can set them off against the words of other men whom the world has counted great, who have uttered their attitude toward the common mass of people. "I hate the vulgar crowd. I keep them at a distance"—so spoke one of the greatest of the ancient poets. Jesus, looking upon the multitude, was full of compassion. "What a city to sack!" was the lustful cry of one of the greatest generals. But he, looking upon the city, wept. "In regard to people, he was not bloodthirsty, but pitiless," it was written of Napoleon. Pitiless—but Jesus, seeing the multitude, was moved to compassion. "The Greek thinkers and statesmen had no regard for the populace, except alternately to bribe and coerce them." But he looking upon the people saw them a flock without a shepherd,

neglected, oppressed by greed, bewildered by ecclesiastical carelessness, torn by their own lusts, and menaced by the black hound whom we call death. A pitiable flock, scattered about, tired, vagrant, torn, drooping—but on the great moorland. This he saw in the multitude—and then, with what seems at first a violent change of figure, he saw them a corn-field, ready for the harvest. The figures are incongruous until one studies into them. And then they become suddenly beautifully congruous. It is because the people are a flock, harried and torn and drooping, that they are ready for the harvest. It is their need and hunger and neglect that make them ready for a Saviour. They are so wounded and bruised and scattered—therefore ready. Such a flock—so exhausted, spent, wandering—such a harvest.

On Jowett's return to England, he became more outspoken upon social responsibilities. More particularly was his sensitized soul grieved at the pitiable conditions in which the World War had left mankind, and the dull-heartedness with which leaders and peoples alike were failing to meet the grave responsibilities of the hour. He therefore gave much thought and energy to the cause of world peace. It is not improbable that this great and good soul bowed and broke under the strain of compassion for a world which still is torn and scattered as sheep without a shepherd.

In the late S. Baring-Gould, who passed away recently after having lived out nine decades of busy life, we find illustration of that which every minister might well covet, namely, breadth of interest and of sympathy, expressed through wondrously varied talent. This, coupled with incessant industry, enabled Baring-Gould to astound the world by his marvelous versatility and productiveness. In this day of specialism, for one to have these words said of him, may seem an indictment, or positive proof of failure; and it is doubtless true that this distinguished writer might have attained a surer place among literary men, had he narrowed his field of interest. A few years ago, this writer noted that Baring-Gould's name was second to none in the number index-cards in the catalogue of

the Library of the British Museum—so large was the quantity of material turned out by him. For any one man to have been preacher, rector of a parish, writer and translator of hymns, adaptor and composer of tunes, a popular novelist, and a writer on widely varying historic and religious themes was an achievement not to be despised. His "Lives of the Saints" in fifteen volumes alone reveals his enormous capacity for work. Though a man of wealth and culture, he was interested in the miners and mill-workers of the shire and their families, opening a mission chapel for them. It was for these he composed his hymn, "Now the Day is Over," one of the most prized of the evening hymns. It is not improbable that S. Baring-Gould will be longest and best remembered by a quickly written production, composed as a processional for a definite occasion—"Onward, Christian Soldiers." Such is the not uncommon irony of a great man's life. The hymn, however, breathes the spirit of the church militant, the church buoyant, the church united, the church triumphant. The church, therefore, will not let it die.

After noting the loss to the world of the living presences of Baring-Gould and of Jowett, we naturally think of the going of Dr. John Clifford. If Doctor Clifford did not have the marvelous versatility of the distinguished churchman Baring-Gould, nor the delicate charm of the Independent Jowett, yet he combined in one personality very much of the many-sidedness of the one and the preaching power of the other, while in down-right virility of character and expression he surpassed them both. As a preacher, a leader, and a great citizen, England has seldom seen his superior. Who that heard his address on John Bunyan, on Elstow Green, in the summer of 1905, or that in Grace Temple, Philadelphia, five years later, will ever forget his personality or his power? When stirred, he spoke with a fiery eloquence that swept all before him. It was not what Dargan calls "skylark eloquence"—"profuse strains

of unpremeditated art," but the outflow of a full mind and an impassioned soul.

Baptist people may well take a sort of holy pride in the fact that so large a number of the really great English preachers of the past century have been from their ranks. One hundred years ago Robert Hall was the outstanding preacher in England. Next came Charles Haddon Spurgeon, possibly the greatest preacher the English-speaking people have produced. At Spurgeon's death Alexander Maclaren was generally regarded the greatest living English herald. When his persuasive lips were stilled, there remained John Clifford. Now that he too is called to "lay down the trumpet and the lamp," the preaching world is truly poorer. But his work lives on.

One of the prominent popular evangelists of the day only a few weeks ago declared his belief that the old-fashioned mass evangelism, with its tabernacle and its great aggregation of paid workers, had become a thing of the bygone days; that he knew of but one great union service being conducted in the entire country. He was of the conviction that evangelism must get back to the local church. Many have been saying the same thing for a long time. Coming from one of the so-called professional evangelists, the observation becomes of peculiar interest. Dwight L. Moody saw the inevitable drift of things years ago, and gave up the tabernacle, retiring to Northfield, where the educational note was blended with that of evangelism; and that work of the later years of that great evangelist still goes on from that notable center of religious blessing. Northfield is the lengthened shadow of a wise soul.

Do we need a new evangelism? is the question that has been raised many times of late. Or is the question a bare tautology? Does not evangelism signify the perennial heralding of good *news*? When some speak of a new evangelism they are thinking of a new theological emphasis, perhaps the shifting from what Christ did *for us* at Calvary, to what he must

do *in us* at conversion, and after. Some are thinking of the change of stress from merely bringing the individual into spiritual safety, to the bringing of society, as well, to moral soundness. Others, when they plead for a new evangelism have in mind the shifting of emphasis from mass effort to that of personal work for individuals. While still others would give the educational feature the major stress, mainly seeking after the children and youth, rather than for the rescue of adults who have gone far in the downward path.

That much may be said for each of these demands for a new type of evangelism is unquestionably true. That earnest men are striving for a better way is not strange. It is fortunate that every age is required to meet its spiritual problems anew, or else religion would grow stale and stagnant. Before us is a little volume entitled "Work, Play, and the Gospel," by Malcolm Spencer, M. A., which is self-styled "A New Evangelism Hand-book." How far such a title seems to mark a departure from the evangelistic ideals of the fathers—work and play conceived of as vital in the making of the Christian and the realizing of the gospel program. The new evangelist does not think of work as a necessary evil, and play an unnecessary evil, as did some evangelists of the past, but he conceives of both work and play as at once subjects of redemption and agencies for the full, rich life of the Christian. When one's daily tasks and one's leisure hours become means of both interpreting and enhancing the spiritual life, life has become evangelized. Who will say it has so become, till work and play have felt the new virtue go into them?

No, we do not need a new evangel, but the *ism* may well change from time to time. "Age cannot wither its eternal message to the human spirit, though custom may a little stale the forms and metaphors in which it is set forth." The word of love and hope is old; it awakens ever new echoes in the changing lives of men. The new wine-skins of which Jesus spoke, we need not fear.

Our contributors to this issue furnish a variety of subject and treatment. President George E. Horr, of Newton Theological Institution, who has taught modern church history in that institution for many years, introduces us to an interesting chapter in the beginnings of English Baptist history in the seventeenth century and discloses how laymen have played worthy parts in critical and confusing eras in the history of the church. Professor Henry B. Robins, of Rochester Theological Seminary, discusses the fundamental theory of missions and incidentally shows the influence that varying theological emphases will inevitably exert upon missionary method —opening a suggestive line of thought for further inquiry in this day of missionary ferment. President Claiborne M. Hill, of Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, California, himself a native Californian, and professor at Berkeley for twenty years, discusses " The Salvation of the Ministry." It is possibly true that one may be at the same time a saved man and a lost minister; surely these are not easy days for the faithful minister, and he is lost, who tries to make them easy.

President George Barton Cutten, of Colgate University, who has for many years given special study to the science of psychology, having issued years ago an able volume on the " Psychological Phenomena of Christianity " and other writings upon related subjects, did service in Europe during the World War, and gives our readers some glimpses of the abnormal mental states induced by the tension of those trying days upon many soldiers of the trenches. Professor Spenser B. Meeser, of the Crozer faculty, begins his thoughtful article on " The Church and the Gospel " upon the basis of facts, not very flattering, disclosed by the stress of the World War, as to the success, or failure, of our past efforts at making men truly and intelligently Christian. Rev. Harold G. Phillips, pastor of the Baptist Church of Mount Vernon, New York, who as among our younger pastors, has already won for himself an enviable reputation for clear grasp of present situations, and for bril-

liant expression of his views, interprets the quality of the young minister's faith to those who may not quite understand just how and why he at times seems to speak a somewhat different language from that of some of his older brethren.

---

Professor Frederick Owen Norton, author of "The Rise of Christianity," reviewed in this number of The Crozer Quarterly by Professor Lewis, and reviewer of President Burton's book, "A Source Book for the Study of the Teachings of Jesus In Its Historical Relationships," died after a brief illness, Friday morning, February 29. This unexpected death is a serious loss to New Testament scholarship and especially to Crozer Seminary. Only two years ago Professor Norton came a stranger, but already he had built himself into the life and ideals of the school and community. He brought to the Seminary an equipment rarely equaled for a brilliant career as interpreter. In addition to exact and comprehensive knowledge of classical and patristic Greek, he had unusual dramatic power in portraying characters and historical situations. His long experience in collegiate administration made him familiar with students' problems, both intellectual and religious, and his Christian sympathy made their solution a joy and a privilege.

His latest book attests his scholarship in the realms of history and philosophy as well as in the Greek and Latin texts through which they found expression. It also bears witness to the reverence and humility and enthusiasm of one who cared more for the message of the New Testament than for the documents as mere historical records. His character vindicated and illustrated the eternal reality of the gospel he interpreted in speech and in literature.

M. G. Evans.

# BOOK REVIEWS

**Prophecy and the Prophets.** Barnard C. Taylor, D. D. Philadelphia. The Judson Press.

At last a sincerely loved teacher has done what hundreds of devoted students hoped he would do. They have often wished to have over his own signature the results of years of patient, thorough, and systematic study. They desired that many who had not the privilege of hearing him in the classroom should discover how at least one teacher could leave tools and shavings in the workshop and bring to his pupils a finished work of art.

The writer of this notice has read Doctor Taylor's book with prejudgment in its favor, for he cannot forget the joyous hours spent in a classroom where the professor did not "lecture" nor "hear recitations," but like a true Socrates asked self-revealing questions. The student did not know how much or how little he knew until the expert cross-examiner had plumbed the depth of the subconscious. He then soon discovered that a kind but merciless surgeon was removing self-complacency. This teacher of the Bible was a real scientist in his mental coloring and in his method and purpose. He sent students to his text as Agassiz sent pupils to fossils. He insisted on accurate observation, patient comparison, and rational interpretation. The net result was that no student packed in his note-book a large amount of sermonic material for future use, but every teachable student acquired habits of study and sanity of method that made the Bible itself a rich treasure-house. When a teacher of such methods and ideals wins the consent of his will to publish a book, it will be small in compass, positive, even dogmatic in statement, compact in phrasing, constructive in purpose. Such is "Prophecy and the Prophets." Six brief chapters deal with prophecy entitled, respectively, Old Testament Prophecy Defined; The Special Work of the Prophets; Prophecy as Scripture; the Theme of Prophecy as Scripture; the Interpretation of Prophecy; Prophecy in Relation to Israel's History.

In Part II there is given in a concise way the conditions, political, social, and religious, of the Israelites at the time of each prophet that the reader may get a clearer insight into the meaning of the prophetic message.

This purpose is accomplished. Each prophet's message is analyzed, and the main teaching pointed out. The author is aware of differences of

opinion about dates, authorship, etc. He does not argue for or against various views, but refers the reader to commentators, giving him the privilege of reaching his own conclusion as to the worth of varying judgments. That the author has his own opinion on a debated question is only incidentally discovered. For example, he writes, "The term 'day of Jehovah' occurs in Joel for the first time." The word "first" locates Joel before Amos. This means that the author does not believe that Joel belongs to the post-exilic period, as many hold.

It is certain that "Prophecy and the Prophets" is a book that can be advantageously read in Old Testament study. It merits a wide circulation.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**Ancient Hebrew Stories and Their Modern Interpretation.** W. G. JORDAN, B. A., B. D. London. Hodder and Stoughton.

WHEN thirty years ago George Adam Smith published, in the Expositor's Bible, his commentary on Isaiah, he brilliantly illustrated how the preacher could effectively interpret the Old Testament prophets and apply their essential principles to present conditions. More clearly than most of his predecessors he made use of those conclusions that were the product of the study. Under his vivid imagination these outstanding personalities of the past were clothed in flesh and blood, and again became the bearers of a divine message to a living world. Doctor Smith has had such a host of successors that these matchless pioneers of religious truth have been constantly kept before the Christian conscience.

But the historical prophets were not the only worthy leaders of Israel. They built on an earlier foundation. Amos and Isaiah had many predecessors, who, if they did not reach the same clear vision, were worthy forerunners, and though often unknown by name, have left us an invaluable heritage.

Stories of rare interest are found in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Many of them are the product of long oral transmission, show the temper of the centuries out of which they came, and embody ideals that made possible the work of the great prophets. Folk-lore some of them have been called. Legendary they may be in part, but they are in the sacred writings of the Hebrews and should not be neglected, at least not by the student.

Because of our preconceived ideas of what Holy Writ ought to be, little use has been made of these stories and that little has largely disregarded everything of an historical nature. But today they seem to be coming to their own. It is now more than twenty years since James

Strahan published his first thin volume on "Hebrew Ideals." Later this was enlarged to three small volumes, and in 1915 all were published in one volume under the old title. Here we find studies based on Genesis, chapters 11 to 50. They are delightful interpretations that fully recognize the origin of the literature, and at the same time find in the ancient story some striking fact or virtue that is made the bearer of a real message to the reader.

A few years later, 1919, Dean Charles Reynolds Brown of Yale published a volume of sermonettes under the title "The Story Book of the Early Hebrews." In this Doctor Brown's well-known pulpit gifts are in evidence. Acquaintance with the general trend of historical study, coupled with the keen insight of the social reformer, has provided the material for the terse sentences and the swift movements of Yale's versatile preacher. Here are essays in religious interpretation which never for a moment lose sight of the practical.

Still more recently another volume covering much the same field has come from the press. This is by Professor W. G. Jordan of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. The author is well known in the field of Old Testament scholarship. In Canada he is also widely known as a preacher of rare gifts; and earlier still, he was an influential pastor. This book is the work of a man who has the instincts of a pastor and preacher as well as the equipment of a scholar.

The critical processes are more to the fore in this volume than in either of the others mentioned, and this is no disadvantage. If Doctor Jordan does not actually show us the scaffolding of the workmen, then he pays close attention to the technique of the artist. This does not mar the general effect, but makes more intelligent the beauty of the ancient canvases.

Selection of material has been a necessity, for even the Old Testament stories are too numerous and too important to be interpreted in a single volume. In this selection the author has shown his usual boldness. He does not always use that which seems the most inviting. He knows his Old Testament, and he does not hesitate to explore all parts of it. The first murder, the tower of Babel, Samson, ritual and robbery, the witch of Endor, Jonah, and even Esther, are among the themes treated. Nor are they camouflaged. Historical origins and primitive significance are made plain. Pious allegorizing plays no part in his method. He well knows that in the field of religion, sincerity is the first demand of an age that everywhere is intolerant of sham and dishonesty. Facts and realities are more important than theories, however hallowed they may be by age or honored by their ancestry.

But with this thorough-going realism there is no place for many of the ancient interpretations. This volume does not read like either the older commentaries or the sermons of a century ago. The method is different. The language is different. The background is not the same. But what of the picture? It is lifelike. It is full of the play of human qualities. The struggles, the hopes, and the failure of men and women are pictured on every page. Nor is it therefore less divine. Eternal law is seen ever at work. The moral law, cursing or blessing; the Spirit of God moving in the individual and in society; the purposes of God coming to expression and ever accomplishing their end; all these are at play in the ancient narratives. After criticism has done its worst and the primitive is seen in all its crudity, the author finds that these stories " still have a ministry, not simply to children but to men of all classes and capacities who preserve a childlike heart and do not allow pedantry to kill the poetry in their souls."

I. G. Matthews.

**The Meaning of the Old Testament.** Hugh Martin. London. Student Christian Movement. 1922.

This is an excellent, popular introduction to the Old Testament with its varied problems and its primary truths. In no sense is it technical, yet it is not forgetful of the splendid work that has been done in so many quarters during the last half-century. While it is brief, it answers in a very sane way a good many of the leading questions that sometimes perplex the religious worker.

The first chapter deals with the vexed question of inspiration. This ought to have been placed last. Our theories ought to follow, not precede, our study. Not only in this arrangement of material, but also in certain attitudes toward the New Testament (cf. p. 50) the author seems under the influence of the old *a priori* methods. Yet his treatment of this theme is the result of deductive studies, and is helpful. That there is an unevenness not only in the literary quality of the different books, but also in their religious values, is frankly admitted. Progressive revelation that implies the passing from the simple to the more complex, from the childlike to the more mature moral and spiritual conception, is in keeping with the well-known facts. Hence we need not be surprised when we find a residuum of the primitive and barbarous in our records. In this chapter, however, as throughout the book, the emphasis is laid on those abiding values that are valid for all time.

In succeeding chapters, the Historical Books, the Prophets, the Law, the Psalms, the Wisdom Literature, and Daniel are treated briefly, but

with discrimination. It is a good book for the layman with an inquiring mind, or for the busy pastor who has not already searched out the treasures of the Old Testament Scriptures.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

**The Literature of the Old Testament in Its Historical Development.** JULIUS A. BEWER. New York. Columbia University Press. 1922.

"POETRY in the Bible. I say there is no poetry in the Bible. It is the Word of God." Thus, not so very long ago, an eminently pious pastor oracularly thundered from the pulpit. This attitude while exaggerated, is neither altogether absurd nor unusual. That there should be anything common or secular in the Scripture seems hard to reconcile with what we know to be its permanent values. We understand the attitude of Origen and his school of allegorists, when they insisted on finding hidden spiritual meanings in all Scripture, especially in the seemingly commonplace. At first we are shocked when we read the Bible in the language of the street or find the Bible treated as a common book.

"The Bible as *literature*" has been a growingly common theme for the last thirty years. This was the title of a volume in which a score of able Biblical students treated various themes of the Old and New Testaments, chiefly in their literary aspects. About ten years later, Assistant Professor J. H. Gardiner, of the English department of Harvard University, published the result of a course of lectures under the title "The Bible as English Literature." The same or similar titles and the same approach have been found not less than a score of times during the succeeding years. "The Modern Reader's Bible" by Moulton, "The Shorter Bible" by Kent, "The Literary Guide to the Bible" by Laura H. Wild, and many others are all infected by the same spirit, and indicate the tendencies of the time.

Now comes Professor Bewer of Union Theological Seminary, New York, with the latest and most thorough-going contribution along the same general line. Surely this is the end that leaders in the Roman Catholic Church saw clearly in the early days of the Reformation. Even the gentle author of Utopia, who later died the death of a martyr, conceived that the rendering of the Sacred Scriptures into the vulgar tongue by the pestilential heretics was a sure sign that the last days had come. Indeed, the ferment of the Reformation is still in process. No longer is the Bible under the lock and key of the sacristan. No longer is either the distribution or the interpretation of Scripture controlled by any tonsured ecclesiast. The Bible is fast becoming common property, and is being subjected to the same canons that apply to other literature,

treated by binderies and interpreters alike as is any other book. What changes a few centuries or even decades have wrought!

Is this for weal or for woe? Is it an indication of prevalent disregard for the Book of books, a subtle attempt to remove it from its age-long pedestal, or does it speak of a new appreciation and an attempt to broadcast the message so that it may gain a hearing beyond the circle of conventional religion? Will this movement strip the Word of its divine sanctions and reduce it to a common level with other literatures, or will it result in the leaven of moral principles transforming many a strange batch of meal?

The fact, however, is that this movement is on, and we have to reckon with it. Professor Bewer's volume is only a sign of the times. It is one in a series entitled "Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies." Thus the literature of Israel is allowed to be placed alongside of, and hence in contrast with, that of Greece, the Franks, the Middle Ages, England, and other more or less important peoples and individuals.

And is this not as it should be? We are in an age of comparative studies. We are compelled of necessity to have some knowledge of world literatures. We must be ready not to volubly assert the superiority of our own, but to furnish reasons. We are again learning that "made in America," good as the slogan may be, cannot hold the market with "made in Germany" unless our merchants and our housewives know that the values are at least equal. No more in religion than in commerce can we hold ourselves aloof from world-currents or erect prohibitive tariff walls. As our merchandise lies on the counter alongside of that from Japan and Germany so must we with confidence submit our Oracles to the test of comparison.

Doctor Bewer has done a good piece of work in this volume. In twenty-two chapters he has traced the growth and development of the Old Testament literature from its early origins to its completion. Thus, in these 436 pages, there lies before us the continuous story of the life-thought of Israel. Not only does the best technical scholarship lie behind this publication, but we constantly see the student at work, and are able to test the reasonableness of the conclusions. It is well written, and should prove easy reading for the layman who has a real interest in his Bible. As one follows from page to page, he is made to relive the ancient scenes, and again feels the dynamic of those messages that has so aroused the energies of centuries.

The author has remedied in part, better than any predecessor, one of the most serious handicaps under which the ordinary student of the Old Testament labors. The existing order of the books in our versions

cannot be defended by rhyme or reason. It bears no relation to the order of composition or to the thought sequence. Books from different centuries are heedlessly huddled together so that the wayfarer knows not whether he is faced toward Jerusalem or Jericho. We can arrive at no comprehension of the divine revelation until we know something of those historic landmarks which give us the key to the spiritual message. The reviewer has had peculiar satisfaction in noting the arrangement of the material presented by the author. It is in substantial agreement with the chronological order suggested in the reviewer's "Old Testament Life and Literature," which came from the press a few months later. The minor divergencies in the order but serve to accentuate the underlying harmony. While no one familiar with the Old Testament problems would assert that all the passages could be assigned with absolute certainty to definite periods, yet there is a preponderating probability as to the time of the origin of most of the Old Testament literature. This is gratifying and seems to provide the basis for the still wider dissemination of the assured facts. Would it not be a boon to the general public if we had an adequate translation of the complete Old Testament in one volume, all arranged in its chronological order?

All of the most important contributions of the Old Testament are referred to, and graphically interpreted, and many of the texts are incorporated in the book in an approved translation. The interpretations are not only lucid but embody a wealth of information. With Professor Bewer's book in hand, it is hard to see how a careful reader could fail to be fascinated by the ever-changing drama of life. The stirring conflicts of the centuries must warm the blood of even the most lethargic, while the story of the triumph of the ideal and the profoundly spiritual over the lower and the base must create within us a healthy confidence in the ultimate victory of the good.

The method used in this volume is surely justified by its fruits. The Old Testament may be studied as the product and the expression of the civilization of its people, and subjected to the same scrutiny and discrimination as any other book. It may take its place as one of a series representing the great literatures of the past. It will not suffer because it is found in such company. In fact only when it is so studied and so compared do its superlative values in the field of literature as well as in that of morals and religion stand out in bold relief. It is because of its peculiar appeal to the mind and heart of man, rather than because of the names of its authors, its hoary antiquity, or even the conventional claims that are made for it, that it holds the premier place amidst the literatures of Babylon and Egypt, of Greece and Rome.

The book under review interprets the ancient story in a straightforward, intelligent way, and makes the reader familiar with those "pioneers of the spirit" who "blazed new paths for the moral and spiritual development of the race."

I. G. MATTHEWS.

**A Source Book for the Study of the Teachings of Jesus in Its Historical Relationships.** By ERNEST DEWITT BURTON. The University of Chicago Press. April, 1923.

THE number of books on the teaching of Jesus is legion, but here is one that is unique in its claim upon the attention of students. It is all that its name implies—a source-book for the teaching in its historical relationships; and is more, in that it gives an excellent epitome of the results of investigation into the origin and historical relationships of the sources and definite directions for their study. The author has done even more than this, and has given us a fresh translation of the New Testament material which he uses, into modern English. Those of us who know something of his accurate and authoritative scholarship in this field will at once recognize the value of this work even in comparison with the other excellent modern translations of the New Testament that have appeared in recent years. When the author says that his "sole purpose has been to make the thought clear," we know that we have in his translation an exceedingly valuable contribution to New Testament study.

The author, who has spent a lifetime of brilliant and painstaking scholarly research in this field, says in his preface that in his courses of University instruction on the teaching of Jesus he has

> increasingly felt the need of a book which should present the material, both of Jesus' own teaching and, for purposes of comparison, of that of his contemporaries, in a convenient form, which should economize the student's time and enable him to concentrate all his attention on the task of interpretation and organization. It is to meet this need that I have prepared this volume.

Not less valuable than the main part of the book is the "Introduction" in which is discussed with great clearness and brevity the nature of the study, the origin, and relationships of the sources, the influence of contemporary Jewish thought, the use of the sources, the method of study, and the point of view and attitude with which the subject should be approached.

According to his custom the author is frank, fearless, and natural in his use of the historical method. He says that

> it is demanded by that regard for facts which is the best and most distinctive characteristic of all modern thinking. That the books of the Bible were not

all written in the same period, or from the same point of view, is a fact of history impossible to deny, too obvious to call for argument. Because of this fact, it is necessary to a right understanding of any book or author that one approaches with as full knowledge as possible of the author's situation, point of view, and purpose, and with eyes open to any distinctive characteristics or elements of his thought. The assumption that there is, in the writings of any Biblical author, nothing distinctive as compared with other Biblical writers or teachers, is unwarranted, and calculated to blind one's eyes to his real thought. To learn a writer's thought we must come with open eyes to discover it, whatever it is, and must bring to our aid all the help that can be obtained through knowledge of his surroundings.

The book gives the most valuable epitome of the results of modern investigation in regard to the origin and relationship of the Gospel records that may be found in all that has been written in this much worked field. A point is made that is often not considered in the study of these sources, namely, that "what they give us is not a first-hand record, but a faithful representation of what the men of the times, when they were written, believed." Some characteristic statements in this discussion are as follows:

The book [John] is primarily an expression of the author's conception of Jesus and the Christian religion, with no intention to misrepresent Jesus. His primary and controlling purpose is not, in the spirit of a historian, to set forth the historical Jesus in his teaching, but to present what he, the writer, believed to be the true conception of Jesus and religion.

In this Gospel [Luke] we possess early sources which the author of the Gospel has reproduced, in large part without purposeful modification in the direction of conformity with ideas current in his day.

Its [Matthew's] chief purpose was, while confirming them in the faith that Jesus was the true Messiah, to convince them that the true religion of Jesus and the true successor of Judaism was a universal religion which recognized the legitimacy of the Old Testament and the Messiahship of Jesus, but abolished all national distinctions and all nationalistic legalism.

As compared with Matthew and Luke, Mark, in so far as it is the source of the others, is undoubtedly a more trustworthy representation of the teaching of Jesus, but as compared with the teaching of Jesus it also is a version of that teaching, undoubtedly affected as the others were, by the period in which it arose.

In regard to the Synoptic Problem the author holds the five document theory and has arranged the sources of material in such a way that a student can easily distinguish the various elements and also one who holds the Q theory, may distinguish the Q passages.

With regard to Paul's letters as sources for the teaching of Jesus, he says:

Coming from a contemporary of Jesus who was at first a bitter opponent of the faith in him, but who afterward accepted him as the Messiah, their testimony to the historicity of Jesus and to such outstanding facts of his career as they state is of the highest value. But this testimony is, even so, indirect; for Paul was not a hearer of Jesus and had only occasional and brief contact with those who were such, and it is not probable that he had any written Gospel or collection of the sayings of Jesus.

The Gospels, Paul's epistles, and Acts

are almost the only sources from which we can derive a knowledge of the teaching of Jesus. But they yield this knowledge only to the interpreter, and interpretation is greatly facilitated by a knowledge of the ideas which were prevalent at the time at which, and in the lands in which Jesus lived and the Gospels arose. Nothing one can learn about the world in which Christianity had its origin will be without significance for his study, but what he most needs to know is the contemporary Jewish thought, the non-Palestinian (Hellenistic), because of its value in the understanding of the Fourth Gospel, the Palestinian, because of its relation to Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels. For this purpose the New Testament itself is perhaps the most valuable source as giving information concerning the thought of the Jews of Jesus' day, but it must be supplemented from the works of Jews who while not themselves Christians, wrote near enough to the time of Jesus to be valuable and direct evidence of the ideas current in his day.

Here follows a complete, well-ordered, and very valuable list of the Jewish literature outside of the New Testament canon with very brief designations of each writing and approximate dates. For example:

*The Psalms of Solomon,* a most interesting collection of Psalms, doubtless written by Pharisees after the break of that party with the Maccabean princes, when instead of accepting John Hyrcanus as the Messiah they denounced his descendants and their adherents as "the Sinners." They predict the coming of a Davidic Messiah of high moral and religious character. The collection may be dated about 60 B. C.

The section on the use of the sources is very helpful. The author says:

We can ascertain the original teachings of Jesus by a process of moving back from our latest extant sources to our earliest discoverable sources and by comparison of sources not related to one another as respectively original and derivative. The great central elements of Jesus' thought are discoverable beyond all reasonable doubt; more exact knowledge can be obtained only by careful comparative study. But every statement of any of the Gospels is authentic in the sense that it reflects for us the opinion held by the Christians of a certain time. To the student of the origin of early Christianity no sentence of the Gospels, Acts, or epistles is to be set aside as having no value for his task.

The book has been prepared as an instrument for the original study of the source material bearing upon and related to the teaching of Jesus. Under each topic selected as suggested above, are given (1) the Johannine passages dealing with the topic, (2) the synoptic passages, (3) passages selected from the Jewish literature and illustrating the views of Jesus' contemporaries, (4) references to modern literature. It is advised that the student make an exegetical study of the Johannine passages, a separate study of the synoptic passages, and then read the passages from the Jewish literature, distinguishing between those which, coming from Hellenistic literature, are more nearly related to the Fourth Gospel and those which, coming from the Palestinian literature, are more akin to the Synoptic Gospels.

Method alone, however, is not sufficient. It is necessary for the student to have the proper point of view and attitude of mind.

> It was never more clear than it is today that in the ideas of Jesus we have the highest ideals of life, individual and social, which the world possesses. To the most effective achievement of such an understanding of the teaching of Jesus one must work in an atmosphere of interest in an understanding of the actual problems and tasks of our own age.

The student must have a sympathetic and intelligent attitude, he must put himself in the position of Jesus, enter by imagination and reflection into his emotional attitude, and as far as possible re-experience his experience. This in turn demands experience on the part of the student, for it is difficult for one who has never had a sense of God to understand one to whom such a sense is the deepest fact of his consciousness. He must also cultivate that sense of fact and intellectual honesty which were so characteristic of Jesus himself.

The source materials are grouped under five heads and thirty-three subdivisions, making an unusually logical and comprehensive analysis of the subject. Among all the usual topics are found such significant ones as "The Highest Values," "Jesus' Own Personal Religion," "The Externals of Religion," "The Mutual Relations of Men in Society," "The Basis and Criterion of Authority for Conduct and Belief," "Jesus' Origin and Birth," "The Authentication of Jesus' Claims," "The Future of the World and the Wicked." Under each of the thirty-three subdivisions the sources are printed in the author's clear translation as follows:

1. The Johannine Teaching
2. The Synoptic Teaching
3. The Views of Non-Palestinian Jewish Writers
4. The Views of Palestinian Jewish Writers

and in a concluding paragraph are given references to modern literature that are helpful to the student.

President Burton has made a notable contribution in this most important field. His book will be an incalculable guide to the student whether in college or in private study. No one can afford to be without it who expects to make a first-hand study of the teaching of the world's greatest Teacher.

F. O. Norton.

**The Rise of Christianity: A Historical Study of the Origin of the Christian Religion.** Frederick Owen Norton. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1924. xxvi, 269 pages. $2.00.

The librarian frequently feels that perhaps the only thing more remarkable than the number of subjects on which books are written is the number of subjects on which books are not written. A companion impression is that so many of the "new books" are not really new; the authors have merely made some revisions of preceding works without sufficient change to warrant the "new" volume.

The origin of Christianity is naturally a topic on which many books have been published. In view of this it might seem that there was no occasion for such a volume as that now at hand. The distinguished and well-informed editors of the series of studies entitled "Handbooks of Ethics and Religion," thought differently, however, and decided that it would be essential to publish in that important series a volume dealing with the origin of Christianity in a new way. I happen to know that they found it not easy to secure such a volume as they desired to issue. When the task was placed in the hands of Professor Norton, however, the way was open for the achievement of their desires. Doctor Norton has taken a field of thought which has many times been treated, and yet he has given us a really new work.

Perhaps its characteristic feature may be said to be the manner in which it deals with the formative ideas which produced the Christian religion. This means that it presents a new and stimulating treatment of the messages of Jesus and Paul particularly. While there is sufficient reference to the general background of conditions to make the presentation of the thought of Jesus and Paul easily understood, the emphasis throughout is on the teachings of Jesus and Paul which laid the permanent foundation of Christianity.

An element of this presentation which is of unusual interest is the manner in which the relation between the thinking of Jesus and that of Paul is outlined. The reader is given opportunity to recognize how the

crucifixion of Jesus, at the same time that it seemed to his disciples to be the final tragedy of his career, was actually the opportunity for a new beginning through the life of such a man as Paul, and how the work of the two together became the basis of life and teachings which led to a world-wide triumph for the religion which Jesus had given.

All this is done in a rare combination of scholarship, historical insight and facility and vigor of language which makes the volume at once a combination of sources, an outline text-book, and everywhere characterized by readability. This union of source-material and easy narrative presentation is secured by placing at the beginning of each chapter detailed references to the relevant portions of the New Testament and other early writings, and then presenting in racy English the outline of thought which those sources naturally supply.

Thus the reader is constantly brought face to face with the source data and at the same time is left free to read when he wishes the narrative which those sources furnish, and at the close of the volume as an appendix he is offered an outline of a similar volume as a stimulus for further study of the material as a whole and in such form as may most appeal. Also, at the close of each chapter, there is a detailed but specific and suggestive list of references for supplementary reading, which is further amplified by a working bibliography as the third appendix to the volume.

The suggestiveness and the utility of the book for classroom use is further enhanced by an appendix which supplies special topics for classroom discussion or assigned papers. There is a fourth appendix which provides a detailed and reliable chronological table of events from 175 B. C. to A. D. 130. The volume closes with a fortunately extensive analytical index to the contents, permitting easy reference to the many names, places, and subjects treated in the work.

Every one who is at all concerned with understanding how Christianity began, what its inner and abiding ideas and forces have been, and how it has unfolded from apparently insignificant origins to world meaning and power, will find in this volume highly unusual material for consideration.

The editors of the series in which this is the latest volume are to be further congratulated on its appearance.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

**The Minister and His Greek Testament.** By A. T. ROBERTSON. New York. George H. Doran Company. Pp. 139.

MUCH of the material that has gone into these pages had before been printed in current periodicals, but is of no less value on that account.

Those of us who sat under Professor Robertson in his earlier days as teacher, will notice that his enthusiasm for his Greek New Testament has no whit abated, but rather deepened and ripened, even as his classes have grown with the years.

Chapter I introduces the minister to his Greek Testament with attractiveness and shows how even one without any knowledge of Greek at all, may by self-training come into much of the value and delight of first-hand acquaintance with the greatest of all Greek books, the New Testament. Chapters II and III deal with contributions from more or less recently discovered papyri, to a better understanding of the Koiné, or common Greek speech, in which the New Testament books were written. Probably all words began in pictures. Professor Robertson discusses in Chapter IV the pictures which the Greek student may find in what might seem the least promising of all linguistic forms, that is, in the prepositions. As an illustration of the possible doctrinal significance of careful exegesis of the smallest particles, a chapter is given on the Greek Article and the Deity of Christ. The use of the negative μή with hesitant questions is helpfully set forth. (Compare review by Professor Vedder of recent English translations of the New Testament, in this issue of the Quarterly.) Preachers in good practise will witness to the sermonic suggestions that have come to them from careful study of Greek words and expressions. Professor Robertson has chapters on "Grammar and Preaching" and on "Sermons in Greek Tenses."

Possibly none but those who had the personal privilege of sitting in the classroom under the guidance of the incomparable teacher of the New Testament and of Homiletics, John A. Broadus, can fully appreciate the final chapter in this little volume. It is entitled "Broadus as Scholar and Preacher." Nothing that has ever appeared in print from Doctor Broadus, or concerning him, has ever adequately expressed the charm and strength of his personality. So saturated was this great teacher and preacher with the spirit and lore of the New Testament that it does not appear unnatural for Doctor Robertson on whom preeminently his mantle fell, to close the book on "The Minister and His Greek Testament" with a chapter on John A. Broadus.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**The Riverside New Testament:** A translation from the original Greek into the English of today. WILLIAM G. BALLANTINE. Pp. 449. Boston. Houghton, Mifflin Company.

**The New Testament.** An American Translation. By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED. University of Chicago Press. Pp. 481.

**Centenary Translation of the New Testament. Vol. I. The Four Gospels.** Helen Barrett Montgomery, A. M., D. H. L., LL. D. Philadelphia. The American Baptist Publication Society. 1924. Pp. 308.

Any attempt to make the New Testament a more vital book is worthy of praise. Doctor Goodspeed has gone much further than Doctor Ballantine in turning the Greek into every-day English. He has also done more in ignoring the old chopping of the text into "chapters" and "verses," banishing them entirely to the foot of the page, while Doctor Ballantine retains the "chapter" divisions in the text, absurd as they often are. Doctor Goodspeed is also more modern in such mechanical matters as punctuation, paragraphing, and the like, though as compared with the King James version Doctor Ballantine does very well. The fault of the old divisions, however, was not that they were divisions, but that they were wrong divisions—made with such lack of intelligence that one could shut his eyes and mark off the text and do little worse. What is needed is right divisions, corresponding to the writer's thought. These are not difficult to make, and would be helpful to the reader. In avoiding one fault Goodspeed has gone to the other extreme, printing each book as a solid block, without divisions. No modern writes in that way, except for a short article or discursive essay.

The chief defect of the first two translations named, as of practically every predecessor, is that little attempt, if any, seems to be made to convey to the English reader the nice distinctions of the tenses of the Greek verb, or the fine nuances of meaning indicated by the Greek particles. The latter must be admitted to be difficult, inasmuch as English is much less rich than Greek in these delicate words, but yet something can be done beyond what any translator has yet had the courage to attempt. A few instances will illustrate.

In Luke 1 : 80 and again in 2 : 40, 52 are phrases that all versions render, "the child grew" or something of the kind. The verb in each case is in the imperfect tense, and should be rendered "the child continued to grow" or "went on growing." In Mark, chapter 4, is a series of parables and brief discourses, each introduced, according to all translators, by the words "and he said." In each case the verb is in the imperfect, and to avoid monotony might be translated the first time "and he went on to say," and in the following cases by "and he added," "and he continued," "and he said further." These discourses close with a verse that Doctor Goodspeed translates thus: "With many such figures he told them the message, as far as they were able to receive it. He said nothing to them except in figures, but in private he explained everything to his own disciples." This conceals from the English reader the

important fact that Mark intends to describe a habit of Jesus, and not to state a single incident. Doctor Ballantine makes some effort, and correctly translates the first verb ("with many such illustrations he went on talking to them") but fails on the others. The translation should be something like this: "With many such illustrations he went on talking to them, as far as they were able to understand him; and it was his practise to speak nothing to them apart from illustrations, while in private, to his own disciples, it was his custom to explain everything." In the story of Martha and Mary, as Luke tells it (10 : 38-42) much of the significance is lost by this failure to attend to the tenses. Doctor Goodspeed is no worse, but also no better than others: "She had a sister Mary who seated herself [continued to sit] at the Master's feet and listened [kept listening] to what he was saying. But Martha was worried [was becoming distracted] with all she had to do for them." On almost every page of both translations may be found similar instances. Doctor Ballantine sometimes tries to make a distinction of the tenses, Doctor Goodspeed seldom or never.

Disregard of the Greek particles is equally noteworthy. Especially significant in Greek is the difference of particles in asking questions. All translators render all cases of the kind in the same way, with no attempt at distinction. For example, in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5 : 46, 47) are two questions with the emphatic form οὐχί, which all translators give as a simple query, "Do not even the publicans the same?" or something equivalent. "The publicans do the same, do they not?" would better indicate the difference. Again in Matthew 26 : 22 is a question with μήτι, which is given by all as "Lord, is it I?" or something of the kind, whereas "Lord, it is not I, is it?" would better express in English the real meaning of the Greek. Similar cases abound.

Both of these translations have been widely advertised as the work of accomplished scholars. Doctor Goodspeed's in particular has had an extraordinary amount of publicity and praise. It is the more disappointing to find that, in spite of their very great merits, both are conspicuously lacking just where we had a right to expect them to be conspicuously strong.

The third book is the first part of a version "published to signalize the completion of the first hundred years of work" of the Society that issues it. Its handy form gives it a great advantage over the other translations; they are bulky, while this can be slipped into a pocket or hand-bag for use at any time—no inconsiderable gain in a version made to be read, and not merely consulted.

This third translation is strong precisely where the other two are weak; without parade of scholarship the translator gives her readers the ripe fruits of it. A rough computation would be, that she correctly renders fully ninety per cent. of the imperfects, while Ballantine attempts no more than ten per cent., and Goodspeed's attempts are a negligible quantity. She is equally successful with the particles. John 7 : 36-52 affords a good test; in that passage there are seven questions with μή, each implying a negative answer. Mrs. Montgomery adequately renders six of the seven, while Ballantine succeeds with one, and Goodspeed fails with all. She is not so successful in dealing with the future tense, and this is the chief defect of her translation; in far too many cases she follows the older versions and transforms into a threat or a promise what is a mere phrase of futurity. Sometimes this results in curious inconsistences, as, "You shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free" (John 8 : 32).

In numerous cases Mrs. Montgomery gives correct renderings where nearly, or quite, all previous translations failed. A good example is Matthew 26 : 64, and a correct translation is of special importance here, for this is the key-passage to an understanding of the teaching of Jesus regarding his "second coming." Ballantine gives us this, "Hereafter you will see the Son of Man," etc. This is bad, for the Greek phrase is ἀπ' ἄρτι; but Goodspeed's is worse. "You will soon see the Son of Man." The American Revised version has, "Henceforth you will see," which is fair. Moffatt, Weymouth, and the Twentieth Century all fail in various degrees—Mrs. Montgomery alone gives the full meaning of the Greek, "From this time on you shall [will] see," etc. Many similar instances might be cited. This version is not only more strictly accurate than the others, but often very happy in its new renderings; for instance: "No slave can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will pay heed to the one and despise the other. You cannot be the slaves of both God and gold" (Matt. 6 : 24).

Mrs. Montgomery keeps (with a half apology) the chapter divisions in the text and the verse divisions in the margin. But she has also edited her text, very successfully employing all modern typographical devices, and using subheads freely as a help to her readers. There is much to be said for her methods, considering the end in view—not so much to produce an ideal arrangement of the text, as one that will attract as many readers (and repel as few) as may be to a new study of the Gospels. Undoubtedly this version will make the Gospels a new book to a great

host, especially among our young people, and the remainder of the translation will be awaited with great interest. "Many [sons and] daughters have done worthily, but thou excellest them all."

HENRY C. VEDDER.

**The Practical Basis of Christian Belief.** PERCY GARDNER, D. LITT. London. Williams & Norgate.

DOCTOR GARDNER'S name is well known to readers of *The Hibbert Journal* and *The Modern Churchman*. Since his university days he has not been content with the conventional in religious thought. He has often disturbed the complacency of metaphysical theologians and orthodox churchmen. His studies in archæology and anthropology had to be related to his inherited religious beliefs and actual spiritual experiences. His *Exploratio Evangelica,* published in 1899, second edition, 1907, was written under the conviction that modifications in the basis and the expression of Christian belief were necessitated by contemporary tendencies of thought. Other books followed rapidly. In 1901, appeared "Historic View of the New Testament"; in 1907, "The Growth of Christianity"; in 1909, "Modernity and the Churches"; in 1913, "The Religious Experience of St. Paul"; in 1915, "The Ephesian Gospel"; in 1918, "Evolution in Christian Doctrine," and also "Evolution in Christian Ethics"; in 1923, "The Practical Basis of Christian Belief." In the preface of the last book, the author describes himself as "a layman and a free-lance." This frank confession disarms the theological critic and charms the adventurous. For, why should an ordained theologian pay heed to a layman? And cannot a free-lance in religious controversy secure followers, quite as well as on the field of battle, specially when the lance is well set and unhorses valiant antagonists? To be sure, the unhorsed may not be severely wounded; they may remount, but not to fight the same sort of battle. They will either be better or worse for the encounter with the valiant free-lance. But Doctor Gardner writes in no adventurous spirit; he is not a knight-errant in search of romance; he is not a layman measuring swords with a priest.

He is too serious in mind and too industrious in painstaking labor to be dismissed as "a layman and a free-lance." There is pathos in the first sentence of his preface to his latest book:

> The coming on of old age warns me that it is time for me to set down in final form the conception of Christian belief to which I have been led by the studies and experiences of many years.

A man's Christian belief is always sacred; it is doubly so when hallowed by confession in old age; and trebly so when confession is made by a tireless thinker who has met the strong cross-currents of contemporary thought and accepted without loss of faith their contribution to the forces that have carried him to an assured happy anchorage. "The Practical Basis of Christian Belief" is, then, practically a confession of faith in view of four tendencies of thought which the author describes as follows:

(1) The spread of the doctrine of relativity over a wider and wider field; (2) the progress of religious psychology; (3) the comparative study of religions; (4) the change in our view of early Christian history.

Some subjects discussed are: Christian Belief; The Nature of Personality; Personality and the Unconscious; Claims of the Spirit; Inspiration and Revelation; Christian Ethics; The Divine Father; The Divine Personality; The Eternal Christ; The Holy Spirit; Personal Immortality and Eternal Life; The Catholic Church. Surely Christian readers interested in such vital themes will read with profit and pleasure if sometimes with dissent but always with sympathy, the conclusions of one who cared enough about God and Christ and the church to spend a long life in reflection upon them.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**Shaken Creeds: The Virgin Birth Doctrine.** A Study of Its Origin. By JOCELYN RHYS. London. Watts & Co.

THIS author frankly rejects the doctrine; but does so after a somewhat thorough and scholarly examination of the sources of the nativity stories. The book is the most complete and inclusive examination of the doctrine in English of which we have knowledge. For those who wish to know the data, both those who accept and those who reject the doctrine, this volume is indispensable. His examination includes consideration of the external and internal evidence as to the date of the books of the New Testament; and he claims that criticism is not an attack on the books, but an attempt to discover the facts about them. Attention is also given to what are called rival forms of Christianity and the influence of Gnosticism on the developing doctrine.

In the direct examination of the doctrine the apparent contradictions in the New Testament teaching are stressed and the probable evolution of the story is suggested. In the chapter on "The Possibility and Improbability of a Virgin Birth" he irrelevantly refers to cases of parthenogenesis. The nativity story is not such a case. Miracle is not rejected by the author *per se,* but only on the ground of insufficient evidence. The chapter on "Other Stories of Virgin Births" lends little strength

to the argument, for one's normal reaction is one of revolt at the comparison of Jesus' conception to the often obscene records. The same may be said about the chapter on "Superstitions and Myths About Conception."

More relevant and convincing matter comes in the chapters on "Spiritual Virgin Births—Gnostic Doctrines" and "Details of the Two Gospel Stories."

No intelligent student of the doctrines of Christianity can fail to give heed to this volume, especially at this time when controversy rages about this doctrine. One should know the utmost that can be written for and against it.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

**The Greater Christ.** ALBERT D. BELDEN, B. D. Philadelphia. The Judson Press. Pp. 216.

THIS little volume is called "Essays in Religious Restatement," and is an effort to bring the old truths of Christianity to a fresh apprehension by those whose thinking has been influenced by the modern world-view. Part I deals with "New Knowledge and the Faith," and undertakes to give light upon such questions as Religion and Evolution, The Fall of Man, Galileo and the Modern Faith, The Authority of the Scriptures, The Divinity of Christ, The Meaning of the Death of Jesus, Did Jesus Rise from the Dead? The Return of Christ, Jesus and Immortality, The Moral Test for the Future Life. It will readily be observed that these chapters deal with matters of current discussion, as old as are the issues involved. The essays (though their author does not attempt to grapple profoundly with these spiritual mysteries) are a successful attempt to make attractive and reasonable some of those central truths of the Christian religion that modern science has seemed to disturb. The disturbance is but seeming, for science has again and again forced Christians to a more and more spiritual interpretation of their own message.

Part II is taken up with twelve brief chapters of practical application. The first of these is on the topic, "The Greater Christ," which has given name to the volume. It is one of the best essays of the series. The preaching minister will find stimulus and suggestion in every chapter from the ready pen of this English Congregational preacher, who has already been widely read. While not so picturesque in style as Mr. Boreham, whose books have freshened many a modern sermon, Mr. Belden writes with great ease and clarity and with a more virile grasp upon the deeper verities of the gospel message.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**The Grand Strategy of Evolution.** William Patten, Ph. D. Boston. The Gorham Press.

In *Science,* New Series, Vol. LI, January 30, 1920, appeared an address by the Professor of Biology in Dartmouth College, delivered at the meeting of The American Association for the Advancement of Science held in St. Louis, Missouri, January 31, 1919. Speaking as Vice-president of the Association he challenged, in somewhat bantering mood, his fellow scientists as follows:

When the layman makes his holiday call on his biological menagerie and points his umbrella at us, hoping to receive through that safety-first device a brush discharge of information, we fail to "come across" with illuminating answers to these very pertinent questions. But to conceal our low potential, and preserve our self-respect, we all resort to certain unintelligible sounds, or warning signals, according to the particular pen in which we have been bred and exercised, and which are guaranteed to scare away, or charm into inaction, the most intrepid questioner. One mumbles something about "environment" and "ecology" and crawls back into the bushes. Another wheezes something about "enzymes" and "vitality," and goes on with his experimenting. Another climbs to the top of his cage and yells "eugenics," while his mate in the corner faintly lisps "euthenics." Some particularly active youngsters jump into a revolving wheel, and every time it makes a complete revolution shout "chromosomes, chromosomes, chromosomes." A few old mossbacks, a rare variety, mournfully harp on "morphology." And one majestic megatherium comprising all in one, coughs up an "energy complex," followed by a prolonged roar, in several volumes, in which one can distinguish the words "action, reaction, and interaction." The clergymen, senators, and Bolsheviki, with their retinues of lady friends, exclaim, "How wonderful, and so true!" Life indeed is complex, energetic, and full of actions, reactions, and interactions! And all of them deeply impressed, go back to their deadly work, and act, and believe, if at all, just as they did before.

After they are gone, all the animals agree that no one has any right to bother real, simon-pure scientists with such fool questions. Let them go to—well, where? To Germany? To Nietzsche, Bernhardi, and Treitschke? To the militant philosophy of dominion; to a half-witted selfishness, in politics, commerce, and kultur, frankly upbuilt on the doctrine of the survival of the fittest; the fittest universally acknowledged, by themselves, to be the Germans and their system?

Or to the spiritualists, anthropomorphists, and sentimentalists who see nothing clearly in the mirror of nature but a distorted image of themselves?

Or to Huxley and his "I don't know" followers, who can discover no ethics or morality in nature-action; neither warning nor invitation, nor directive discipline, but merely a drab, unoriented neutrality of "unmorality," leaving man nothing but himself with which to orient himself; leaving him to create his own system of ethics and morality out of his own inner consciousness.

The biologist has found no evidence for the broad assumptions of these

philosophers. In nature, he sees no one-sided dominion of the strong over the weak, or the weak over the strong; no special privileges; and no freedom from obligations. Neither does he see any warrant for puling sentimentality, nor any expectation of an unaggressive neutrality in nature-action.

Nature, so far as we have been able to discover, is an enduring, self-constructive system, gaining and preserving her gains in a definite way, according to her own system of ethics and morality. In so far as nature-growth is manifest in evolution, we can not deny that at least to that extent her ethics are constructive and her morals saving.

But the speaker was not playful. He asked his brother biologists a serious question:

But now that we biologists, as evolutionists, feel reasonably safe in our storm-proof shelters of established facts, the spirit of adventure again leads us forth to wider excursions, and we ask ourselves whether it is possible to reduce all the constructive processes of nature to a simple formula, which can be expressed in familiar terms of universal human significance.

Whether Professor Patten intended it to be so or not, "The Grand Strategy of Evolution" may be taken as an effort to answer his own question. And it is an answer well worth making. The mastery of details and comprehensive grasp of imagination that characterize grand strategy characterize his book. Though the vocabulary is oftentimes unusual and the sentence structure sometimes rugged, the argument is clearly presented by a wealth of illustrative material that only an industrious scientist could accumulate. A biologist alone can suggest such metaphors as are wrapped up in this sentence, for example:

The mental feelers of society, like the tentacles of a crawling animal, must be fully extended to the outer world, coming into intelligent contact with nature at every possible point, in order that man may rightly find his way through her mazes of constructive and destructive agencies.

And there are many such sentences of interpretative insight. Professor Patten sees cooperation, helpfulness, constructive "rightness," creative purpose in "nature growth," that enable a believer in Divine guidance to justify the ways of God to men. He closes his volume with a short summary which is worth quoting in entirety, but two short paragraphs show the author's serious moral purpose in writing:

A limited perspective is always confusing, for the very reason that the diversity of nature-action is always unified. We instinctively resent the wanton destruction of creative values; we are appalled by nature's apparent carelessness of individual life and, to us, the unmeaning usage of her overwhelming power. But the wider perspective of the evolutionist tends to correct this

mental confusion; and his mental attitude to nature-action, more rightly oriented, renews and fortifies his faith in nature's creative purpose.

Our resentment of the world's injustice vanishes when we come to feel the sense of growth and ownership in the world about us, and in its growth participate. The strictest discipline and greatest hardships are no longer such, if we know that through them we better play the game; if as parent, patriot, explorer, artist, student, or as worker in any line whatsoever of human endeavor, our ideals are still preserved and we truly seek and strive to satisfy our great desire.

Professor Patten is another scientist who finds in evolution confirmation of the fundamental moral principles maintained by preachers of Christian ethics.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**The Dance of Life.** HAVELOCK ELLIS. Boston and New York. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. xiv, 377.

THIS, the last output of the famous anthropologist, is a volume of deep interest. The author suggests that possibly the germ of this work fell into his brain in youth. Certainly there are evidences, on every page, of erudition and of maturity of reflection. Mr. Ellis has long conceived of life as an art, and of the various fine arts as fundamental for living. The choicest spirits of all ages, thinks the author, have seen life from this angle.

There are but two primary and essential arts, says Mr. Ellis, dancing and architecture—the former being the beginning of all the arts that are of the person, such as music, acting, poetry; the latter, the beginning of those that lie outside the person—sculpture, painting, and all arts of design. Because of the significance of the dance, socially and religiously, in the history of the race, especially of primitive man, Mr. Ellis gives a most suggestive chapter to "The Art of Dancing"; and for the same reason, no doubt, names his book, "The Dance of Life." For the dance to have been divorced from religion, where it had its birth, becoming either merely sensuous or professional, is but a sign of social decay, rather than a note of progress.

Dancing, we may see throughout the world, has been so essential, so fundamental, a part of all vital and undegenerate religion, that, whenever a new religion appears, a religion of the spirit, and not merely an anæmic religion of the intellect, we should still have to ask the question of the Bantu, "What do you dance?"

The author's metaphor "The Dance of Life" is suggestive, but like most metaphors has its limitations.

The chapter on "The Art of Thinking," reminds us that after all, there is not that sharp distinction between art and science that some infer. The great scientists, even like the lunatic, the lover, and the poet, must realize, with their imaginations, the unseen world. The scientist cannot go very far without "summatory fictions" and hypotheses which guide to action, and become indispensable to progress. "The Art of Writing" is treated with somewhat less satisfaction, but with sprightliness and fulness of literary allusion.

One most naturally turns to the chapter on "The Art of Religion." Mr. Ellis conceives of religion, in "its quintessential core" as mysticism—"the relationship of the Self to the Non-Self." The assumed hostility between religion and science originates with the unthinking. "Both spring from the same root in natural human activity." The opposition is of comparatively modern origin. Among primitive peoples "The 'medicine man' is not more an embryonic man of science than he is an embryonic mystic." Science began in magic. And while human evolution involves a division of labor, a fundamental antagonism between science and religion is not to be thought of. If this hostility appears, there is something wrong, either with our science or our religion, or with both. Hypertrophy of religion with atrophy of science in the same individual, or hypertrophy of science and atrophy of religion, are both alike morbid. It is difficult to conceive a Darwin and a St. Theresa entering with full and genuine sympathy into each other's point of view. When once either the scientific attitude, or the religious, has been atrophied, it is difficult to repair the loss. The author cites the case of Sir Isaac Newton:

> one of the most quintessentially scientific persons the world has seen, a searcher who made the most stupendous efforts to picture the universe intelligently on its purely intelligible side, seems to have realized in old age, when he was indeed, approaching senility, that the vast hypertrophy of his faculties on that side, had not been compensated by any development of the religious side. He forthwith set himself to the interpretation of the book of Daniel and puzzled over the prophecies of the book of Revelation, with the same scientifically serious air as though he were analysing the spectrum. In reality he had not reached the sphere of religion at all; he had merely exchanged good science for bad science.

Sir Oliver Lodge is also cited as a physical scientist who at length waked up to his neglect of the things of the spirit, and so has found satisfaction "in speculating concerning the origin of the soul, and in hunting out tags from poets to support his speculations." The man of science may be a mystic, thinks the author, but he cannot be a true mystic "unless he be so relentless a man of science that he can tolerate no alien science in his

mysticism." Equally, the mystic may be a man of science, but he will not be a true man of science unless he keeps his science free from mystical emotion. The harmony between them rests on the faith that they are eternally separate, however intimately cooperative.

Mr. Ellis also gives consideration to "The Art of Morals." He deplores the fact that morals, though among the most perennially interesting of all themes, should be so generally understood as blind obedience to words of a command, or a perfunctory keeping in step, or pretending to keep in step, with the mass. Morals begin in the *mores* or customs of the people, and tend to become crystallized into rigid rules and conventions, with little reference to reason. Thus it comes about that the most moral man may sometimes be accused of immoral action in breaking with the rules that have been set up. Naturally, here the Greek and the Hebrew attitudes are seen in contrast. "Morality is in the strict sense a matter of taste," declares the author; that is, of æsthetics, of what the Greeks called *αἴσθησις*. So "goodness" and "sweetness" are the same thing. It is quite correct to say that "the true, the beautiful, and the good" lie close together in a full rich life, but the author does not adequately explain why the Greeks, with all their love of the beautiful, a love carried even to the point of worship, went the road of moral decay, surrounded with so great a wealth of natural and artistic beauty; or how it came about that their philosophers could discourse so loftily upon the beauty of morals, while they themselves were giving reins to the grossest self-indulgence and fleshly passions. There is something more in morals than seeing the good as beautiful. The Hebrews, to be sure, were often rigid and gloomy, from the view-point of art. They did not "consider the lilies, how they grow." The rod of Jehovah rather than "the beauty of holiness," thinks Mr. Ellis, guided them; and he is of the opinion that too much of this spirit passed into Christianity. And yet, again it may be replied, the Hebrews, rather than the Greeks, have been the moral leaders of the world. This achievement was not due, however, to the fact that the Hebrew saw a rod where others felt the perfume of the lily, but because the Hebrew's God was superior in moral character and worth. The Jehovah of the great Hebrew prophets was a righteous God. Any reliable morality must be reenforced by profound religious sanction and founded upon spiritual verities.

The "Conclusion" raises the much bruited question of civilization, and the standards by which we may judge of progress. Statistics are very deceptive; for one is never "sure that one is operating with figures of equal weight." We undertake to gauge "civilization" and "progress" without being sure we know what either means. We may measure

*material* facts, but there are *intellectual* facts and *moral* facts, not so easily measurable. Take criminality, for example. Is the presence of crime an indication of a low state of civilization? As a matter of fact, the higher the civilization, the larger the number of the recognized breaches of orderly life. Besides, there are crimes that are man-made crimes and crimes that are natural crimes. As to intellecual tests, the ability to produce original, creative personalities, and the general diffusion of knowledge may be regarded as among the qualities by which a country or a civilization may be judged. Says Mr. Ellis:

> Consider the United States for instance, during the past half-century. It would surely be hard to find any country, except Germany, where education is more highly esteemed or better understood, and where instruction is more widely diffused. Yet, so far as the production of high, original genius is concerned, an old Italian city, like Florence, with a few thousand inhabitants, had far more to show than all the United States put together.

From this the author is inclined to think, without good reason in the opinion of the reviewer, that the two tests are quite incompatible. On the contrary, there must be a general diffusion of knowledge in order that opportunity may be afforded for the adequate discovery and training of the original genius.

It is impossible here to follow the author in his effort to grapple with confessedly so complex a problem; which in fact is left unsolved. "The Dance of Life" is not a systematic, or scientific treatment of any subject, but a very stimulating series of meditations upon life, strung together by a slender thread of fancy, and adorned with many bits of learning, accumulated throughout a long life of study of varied peoples and literatures in abundance. It is not science. It is not quite literature. But it is provocative. EDWARD B. POLLARD.

**Ignatius Loyola. An Attempt at an Impartial Biography.** HENRY DWIGHT SEDGWICK. New York. The Macmillan Company. Pp. 399.

AN adequate biography in English of Loyola has long been both a desideratum and an impossibility. Until a comparatively recent date a large part of the original sources were inaccessible, to Protestant scholars at any rate. Mr. Sedgwick had a new field to explore, therefore, and he has done his work with diligence. It was highly desirable that the life of one of the greatest men of the Reformation period should be told, neither from the Catholic nor the Protestant point of view, but impartially. How well has the author succeeded in his attempt? will be the question most readers will be inclined to ask.

On the whole, very well. The biographer has avoided the *odium theologicum* entirely, one would say, and his occasional failures in impartiality seem due to his strenuous attempt to be impartial. "He stands so straight that he leans backward," would about express the fact. To be "impartial," Mr. Sedgwick seems to think, requires him to reject the Protestant view of facts, even when that view is just; and so, by special pleading, he gets out of the way every awkward fact that militates against the saintly portrait of Ignatius that he draws. He accepts without question, in many cases, the contention of Catholic controversialists, as in the famous instance of the Jesuit doctrine "that the means justifies the end." Mr. Sedgwick disposes of this by saying, "I have read in Catholic sources that no evidence in support of this charge has ever been forthcoming against the Society" (p. 350). One wonders if he has ever read Pascal's "Provincial Letters."

There is no need to point out other cases in detail. The most serious defect of the book is the failure to assess at its true spiritual significance the quality of the "Spiritual Exercises" and the adoption by Ignatius of the principle of submission to authority as the fundamental principle of his own religion and of his order. Mr. Sedgwick quotes twice, and both times almost with approval, this saying of Ignatius,

> To attain the truth in all things, we ought always to hold that we believe what seems to us white to be black, if the Hierarchical Church so defines it.

This and his *sicut ac cadaver* ("just like a corpse") may be taken as the fundamentals of Jesuitism. Does "impartiality" require that we give this principle our approval, however qualified? Must one be equally ready to say "Good Lord" or "Good devil" to be really "impartial"? Are there no real distinctions between good and evil, and do we become partial judges when we approve the good and condemn the evil? And if there is any doctrine that deserves unqualified reprobation, is it not this doctrine of submission of the human soul to the dictates of any external "authority"?

One of the minor exasperations of the reader is the insertion of quotations, in some instances amounting to several pages in length, without any indication of their character by the conventional signs—change of type or quotation-marks.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

**The Christian Movement in Japan, Korea, and Formosa: A Year Book of Christian Work.** Printed in Japan. Published by the Federation of Christian Missions. 1923. vii, 697 pages. $2.50.

THE volume now in hand is the twenty-first annual issue of a work which is indispensable for those who wish to be familiar with the activities and development of Christianity in the Japanese empire. Special attention is called to this annual because it probably is far too little known among even Christian people in the United States who have some interest in what Christianity is accomplishing among the Japanese people.

The work is a result naturally of cooperative efforts on the part of the various organizations which are engaged in missionary service in the Orient. Some of the topics discussed are the same from year to year, and are handled in such a manner as to reveal the changes which are occurring and the progress that is being made. Each year, however, some special activities are so reviewed as to give an adequate idea of special aspects of Christian work and thought and the outcome of their application in Japanese life. This twenty-first volume has, for example, a historical sketch of the Sunday-school work of Japan and also a presentation of the service which has been carried on for lepers.

While this series of volumes may not be one which every minister should be expected to possess, it is a source of information with which he should be familiar by securing a loan of portions of it, if purchase seems impracticable. Any one of the twenty-one volumes will supply suggestions and stimulus for aggressive thinking concerning the advance of Christianity in the East.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

**The Rise of Universities.** CHARLES HOMER HASKINS. New York. Henry Holt & Co. 1923. ix, 134 pages. $1.50.

THIS volume is the seventh issue in the series of the Colver Lectures. These lectures are an established feature at Brown University as a result of the Colver Lectureship Fund which was presented to Brown by Mr. and Mrs. Jesse L. Rosenberger of Chicago in memory of Mrs. Rosenberger's father, Charles K. Colver, of the class of 1842 in Brown University. The lecturer in 1923 is Professor of History and Political Science and Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science in Harvard University.

In choosing to treat the Rise of Universities he selected a topic which is of much wider importance than might be supposed, and he has discussed it in a manner which makes the subject of real interest to all who have a desire to understand the history and meaning of colleges and universities at the present time.

It is one of the mistakes in life to take for granted those things with which we are familiar and, as a result, too little to understand their

meaning when their history is taken into account. Professor Haskins in this volume has opened a door through which all may have a general but reliable knowledge of the growth and meaning of higher education. They may readily accomplish this by using this companionable and informing sketch, which reviews the nature of the earliest universities, the life and methods of the mediæval professors, and the activities and ambitions of the students during those periods in which our present-day college and university education was being founded, and paving the way for the remaking of human thought and the unfolding to the human mind of the possibilities which have given us science and all its attendant benefits.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

**The Constructive Revolution of Jesus. A Study of Some of His Social Attitudes.** SAMUEL DICKEY, recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in McCormick Theological Seminary. New York. George H. Doran Company. Pp. 165.

**Christianity and Social Science. A Challenge to the Church.** CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, PH. D., LL. D., Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri. New York. The Macmillan Company. Pp. 220.

THESE are two of the most interesting and profitable of recent studies of our social problems in the light of Christianity, that is to say, the teachings of Jesus. If every minister who reads this Quarterly could be persuaded to procure these books, master them, and apply their teachings in his ministry, it would mean much for the progress of the kingdom of God. No better investment of money and time could be made.

Doctor Dickey has full scholarly equipment for study of the social attitudes of Jesus, and a fearless spirit without being rash. He discusses the solutions that Jesus offered for the social problems of his day, such as the permanent value of the Mosaic Law, the significance of the temple and its ritual, the political dominance of Rome, and the economic order of the age. He points out that Jesus was revolutionary and drastic in dealing with the current morality and religion of his day, to a degree that few of his followers yet realize. He shows that our own commercial, industrial, and political life remains largely unchristianized.

> We are almost as pagan as they were in Jesus' day. We have only played with the application of his principles to society, and have yet to discover how revolutionary his ideas are.

At the same time Jesus indicates the way to reconstruction. "He sought to change the very nature of man, and emphasized therefore essential prin-

ciples for the reformation of his character." Doctor Dickey therefore gives no quarter to those who cry, "You can't change human nature." If that is true, Jesus was a mere dreamer who lived and died in vain.

Doctor Ellwood is already favorably known through his "Reconstruction of Religion." He approaches the question from the opposite side, as a student of social science primarily, but reaches practically identical conclusions. He too insists on the plasticity of human nature, as demonstrated by the social sciences, and indicates as the three principles along which man as an individual and society as a whole may be reshaped, socialization, mutual service, and good-will or love. Religion, he points out, is the most potent means known to social science for exercising social control and changing social patterns. Hope of progress therefore lies in a synthesis of social science and religion.

> Social science needs the aid of religion if it is to become something more than a polite amusement, and religion needs the aid of social science if it is to become practical for human living.

The book is an explication and application of these ideas. The conclusions that the author reaches may be regarded as summed up in the pointed questions that he suggests at the close of the chapters for discussion, such as:

> Is the Christian church willing to proclaim the Christian revolution, and to reaffirm its unfaltering faith in the pattern set by its Founder? Is the Christian church willing to make the service of mankind the service of God, and to ask all its members to dedicate their lives and possessions to that service? Is the Christian church willing to sacrifice itself in order to save the world?

It is the chief task of the Christian ministry today to help the church answer these and kindred questions with a hearty "Yes."

HENRY C. VEDDER.

**The Teaching Pastor.** WILLIAM C. BITTING, D. D. Philadelphia. The Judson Press.

THIS book is the publication of lectures delivered on the Samuel A. Crozer Foundation at Crozer Theological Seminary, March, 1923. The deed of gift establishing this lectureship provides that, "The topics of these lectures to be subjects that are profitable to be presented to Christian ministers or students for the ministry." Never has any trust been more satisfactorily fulfilled, both in spirit and in letter, than this one by

the gifted pastor of the Second Baptist Church, St. Louis, Missouri. His long and varied ministry as preacher, pastor, teacher, administrator, and executive in responsible denominational offices, enabled him to judge unerringly what is profitable to be presented, especially in these years of new appraisal of Christian values. He knows thoroughly the diseases that have imperiled the health of the church in the past, and which today rob it of that vitality it must have in order to lift the world out of evil. The disease and the cure are suggested in the first lecture, entitled, "Need and Opportunity for His Ministry":

> The pastor should correct mistaken ideas, produced not only by inaccurate conceptions of what the Bible is, but also by faulty methods of Bible study. Conceptions of God, of providence, of sin, and of many other religious factors have suffered because of erroneous methods of study. No intelligent minister will live long with the average congregation before he discovers these errors. This is a serious matter. People have rightly been taught to attach high authority to the Scriptures. They have been declared to be the rule of faith and practise among Christians. It is, therefore, no light matter to appeal to them. When a high ideal of Biblical authority is joined with mistaken methods of interpretation and ignorance of what the Bible really teaches, the lives of sincere but misguided people are harmed. Many have put divine authority behind their erroneous conceptions. The result has been distortion, deformity, and disease of spiritual life. Here a real healing ministry is possible.

"A real healing ministry is possible." What a revealing sentence! It is a call for service, a remedial service, an evangelizing service, the service of the physician. Teaching was the Great Teacher's method of expressing the compassion that moved him. And today as then multitudes are as sheep not having shepherds. Compassion for them will send the pastor to long laborious preparation for teaching truths that will stand the test of the coming years. His will be a prophylactic ministry. His children in the gospel will not be frightened by cries of timid souls who think science or philosophy can destroy what they have learned.

One is tempted to quote many passages to illustrate the temper, method, scope, and aim of the lectures. Let two suffice:

> A Bible-loving people will be missionary, evangelistic, educational, and philanthropic. . .
>
> When people come to worship on Sundays, or to deal with the experimental and practical concerns of the Christian life at the week-day services, they should not be conducted into a laboratory. . . While a pastor in preaching should be rigidly true to sane processes of interpretation, he aims to comfort, inspire, and persuade men, and to affect their lives. The exhibition of critical processes in the pulpit is not only bad taste, but is an effort to feed hungry hearers upon pots and pans and cook-stoves instead of the wholesome and appetizing food which has been prepared in them.

Only a pastor who has rare human sympathy, a world-wide outlook, a time-long vision, a mastery of method in Biblical study, and experience in the technique of pulpit teaching could have produced these lectures. It is a privilege to commend this book to all who wish to make their ministry effective, whether they be pastors or Sunday-school teachers; and to laymen also who desire to be well informed in the ideals of Biblical scholarship.

MILTON G. EVANS.

**Business Methods for the Clergy:** A Manual for the Desk. MARSHALL M. DAY. Milwaukee. Morehouse Publishing Company. 1923. xiii, 46 pages. $0.75.

THIS small and inexpensive work is far more important than its size and price may seem to indicate. The author has recognized clearly one of the weaknesses of ministerial activities. He states in his preface that the book is not written for "the senior clergy, whose methods of work are established," but that he has in mind "the theological student, planning how he will organize his life when at last he ceases preparation and begins" the service which the young clergyman is to render. This is really too modest a statement of the purpose of the volume, since it contains much which may be utilized by a minister of open mind who is already in the midst of ministerial work.

Every young minister now entering upon his pastoral life or making preparation for it ought to possess a copy of the book and absorb the potentially fruitful suggestions which it furnishes, since there is nothing else which at all deals with this important subject as Mr. Day has treated it, and because he has distinctly placed all ministers under possible obligation.

His modesty leads him to say further in his preface that the book does not contain "an original idea," but that it merely brings together what has already been tested in the work of many clergy and business men. One need in the ministry is that the suggestions here offered shall be used by all. There is the more occasion for this applying of the work of Mr. Day because the volume treats the ordinary problems of the minister and offers concrete plans for work and records, methods of pastoral labor, and other practical proposals for economizing time, accomplishing the largest possible service, and attending to ministerial work with a directness, clearness, and accuracy which together will achieve the good results that every true clergyman seeks.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.